

KANSAS CITY, MO. PUBLIC LIBRARY



92

G2315n

Hinsdale
James A. Garfield's
public life

Acc No.

22052

KEEP YOUR CARD IN THIS POCKET

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for two weeks, subject to renewal for a like period. Borrowers finding book marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

No books issued unless fines are paid.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



**PUBLIC LIBRARY,
KANSAS CITY, MO.**

KEEP YOUR CARD IN THIS POCKET

THE
REPUBLICAN TEXT-BOOK
FOR THE
CAMPAIGN OF 1880.

A FULL HISTORY
OF
GENERAL JAMES A. GARFIELD'S PUBLIC LIFE,
WITH OTHER POLITICAL INFORMATION.

BY
B. A. HINSDALE, A. M.,
PRESIDENT OF HIRAM COLLEGE.

NEW YORK:
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY,
1, 3, AND 5 BOND STREET.
1880.

COPYRIGHT BY
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY,
1890.

* * The publishers acknowledge the courtesy of "Harper's Weekly" for the portrait of General Garfield, which appears on the cover of this work.

NEW YORK, July 30, 1880.

PRESIDENT B. A. HINSDALE, Author of "The Republican Text-Book for the Campaign of 1880," is an intimate personal friend of General Garfield's of many years' standing. He has devoted much time and labor to making his book a full and authentic compendium of useful political information. It is well adapted to popular reading, and will be found especially useful to political speakers and writers. Believing that its circulation in the coming campaign will do great good, we take pleasure in commending it to the public.

MARSHALL JEWELL,

Chairman Republican National Committee.

S. W. DORSEY,

Secretary.

INTRODUCTION.

It is believed that this book embodies a new idea. Political handbooks are common enough. Those of Mr. Edward McPherson, in particular, are widely known and highly valued. Such books, however, consist for the most part of political documents and statistics : Bills, Acts of Congress, Messages, Orders, Resolutions, Platforms, Records of Votes, and Election Returns. Little of this kind of material will be found in this work. Its range of information is fully shown by the Table of Contents, but it will be well to indicate here its leading features. These are two in number :

FIRST. To present to the American people the Republican candidate for President as a PUBLIC MAN. This will be done by presenting the public life and services of General Garfield in an historical sketch, and by presenting such extracts from his speeches and papers as will exhibit, in a compendious form, his opinions on the leading political questions of the last twenty years, and especially those that enter into the present canvass. It is many years since a man with so full a political record has been a candidate for President. Perhaps no man was ever a candidate for this high office who had traversed so many fields of thought and discussion. Sometimes the candidates have been successful soldiers or little-known civilians, with either no civic history or a very short one. But an independent journal has very justly said of General Garfield : "*He has been for many years an industrious member of Congress, who has borne a prominent and able part in the work of legislation, has long had a considerable share in shaping or carrying all measures of importance, and whose opinions on the great topics of the day are perfectly well known.*" In doing this work, General Garfield has freely uttered his thoughts on all the leading topics of the times, and the central idea of this text-book is to put into the hands of the reader authentic materials for judging his record.

CO SECOND. To present a variety of other political information that will be useful to the intelligent citizen, and especially to speakers and writers in the residential canvass.

Quotations from leading Democratic politicians, from educators, scholars, and the religious press, will show the impression that General Garfield has made on these classes of citizens. A sketch of the Vice-Presidential candidate, General Chester A. Arthur, is also included. The recent history of the two great parties is given, as are also the platforms for 1880 and the letters of acceptance of the candidates. The current charges against General Garfield are fully presented and examined. It should be added that the pamphlet editions of General Garfield's speeches are followed in all cases where such editions have appeared. These speeches were revised by the author, and are therefore more authoritative than the "Globe" and "Record" reports.

It is proper to add that the author was strongly solicited by a Chicago firm to write a life of General Garfield. This he would have done, had it not been for the General's desire that he should undertake the present work. It may be further added that the author has known General Garfield intimately for nearly thirty years; that he has been a close and interested observer of his life as student, teacher, soldier, and statesman; and that he has spared no pains to make this work, in all that relates to General Garfield's public life, full and authentic. The General himself has materially contributed to this end by furnishing interesting lines of inquiry. However, he is responsible for nothing found in this book, except what is quoted from him in terms.

B. A. HINSDALE.

HIRAM, O., *July 28, 1880.*

CONTENTS.

PART I.

GENERAL GARFIELD'S PUBLIC LIFE.

CHAPTER I.

THE ORANGE BOY.—Abram and Eliza Garfield, Birth and Boyhood of James A. Garfield; Stories about him	7
---	---

CHAPTER II

GARFIELD THE STUDENT.—School at Chester; History there told in a Letter; Early Character, Hiram and its Institute; Student and Teacher; Williams College; Letter of President Chadbourne	8
--	---

CHAPTER III.

THE HIRAM TEACHER.—Relations to Hiram; Range of Teaching; Character as a Teacher; Letter of Garfield to a Student; Chapel Lectures; as School Administrator, Preacher, and Popular Lecturer	11
---	----

CHAPTER IV.

POLITICS AND THE OHIO SENATE.—Entry into Politics; Speeches from 1856 to 1860; elected to State Senate; Services in; admitted to the Bar	14
--	----

CHAPTER V.

GARFIELD THE SOLDIER.—Lieutenant-Colonel; Colonel of the Forty-second Regiment; Sandy Valley Campaign, Brigadier-General; Shiloh; in Alabama; Sick-leave, in Washington; Rosecrans's Chief of Staff; Garfield on moving the Army; Tullahoma Campaign; Chickamauga; Major-General; elected to Congress	17
---	----

CHAPTER VI

CONGRESSMAN GARFIELD	22
----------------------	----

Thirty-eighth Congress.

On Military Committee; Speeches on Draft Bill, on Confiscation of Rebel Property,	
---	--

on Commerce between the States, on the Abolition of Slavery; Investigation of the Treasury; Oration at Ravenna, O.	23
--	----

Thirty-ninth Congress.

Member of Ways and Means Committee; Speeches on the Public Debt and Specie Payments, on the Tariff, on National Bureau of Education, on Freedman's Bureau; Argument in the Milligan-Bowles Case; Trip to Europe; Sermon in Chester Cathedral	27
--	----

Fortieth Congress.

Speech in Jefferson, O., on Finances; Chairman of the Military Committee; Report on the Army; Speeches on Reconstruction, on Impeachment, on the Currency, on Taxing U. S. Bonds, on Mr. Stevens's Record; Oration at Arlington	31
---	----

Forty-first Congress

Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency; Efforts to improve the National Census; the Act to strengthen the Public Credit; Bill to increase Banking Facilities; Speeches on said Bill, on Public Expenditures and Civil Service, on the McGarraban Claim; Gold-Panic Investigation and Report	35
--	----

Forty-second and Forty-third Congresses.

Chairman of Committee on Appropriations; Studies of the Subject of Appropriations; Article in "North American Review"; Speech on enforcing the Fourteenth Amendment; Removal of the Flatheads; Credit Mobilier and Salary Charges in the Nineteenth Ohio District	39
---	----

Forty-fourth Congress.

Democratic House; on Ways and Means Committee; Reply to B. H. Hill, Reply to L. Q. C. Lamar; Visit to Louisiana; the Electoral Commission Bill; Speech on; Member of Commission; Senator Thurman's Construction of the Bill	46
---	----

PART I.

GENERAL GARFIELD'S PUBLIC LIFE.

PREFATORY NOTE.

JAMES A. GARFIELD is eminently a many-sided man. He has distinguished himself in many kinds of activity. His history is full of kaleidoscopic changes and surprises. On the whole, it would be hard to name an American now on the stage of political action who offers to the biographer a more inviting theme. To present and illustrate him in all his aspects and lights, is the chosen and pleasing duty of a score of biographers. Such is not the scope of this sketch. For the most part, it will be confined to his public life. Beginning with his boyhood, the story will expand as we enter the student period; will widen out still further in the teacher and soldier periods; and will fully cover the Congressman. The stump and the bar, literature and the study, will also receive attention. Still, all the time, the central point will be the public man.

CHAPTER I.

THE ORANGE BOY.

"I have planted four saplings in these woods; I must now leave them to your care."—*Abram Garfield's last words to his wife.*

ABRAM GARFIELD, the father of General Garfield, with Eliza Ballou, his wife, he born in New York of Massachusetts stock, and she born in New Hampshire, moved into the woods of Orange, Cuyahoga County,

Ohio, in the month of January, 1830. Mr. Garfield had bought there fifty acres of land that he and his wife expected to clear up and pay for by the labor of their hands, and to make a home for themselves and their children. In 1833, before the debt was discharged, Garfield died from overwork, exposure, and bad medical treatment. His widow was left in exceedingly straitened circumstances, with four small children. She was surrounded by a dense forest, broken only by the occasional clearings of the settlers. Twenty acres of the narrow strip of land were sold at once to meet the crisis. On the remaining thirty, with such help as relatives and friends—nearly as poor as herself—could give, she kept the family together, and reared the children to adult age.

JAMES ABRAM GARFIELD, Republican candidate for President in the campaign of 1880, was the youngest of these four children. He was born November 19, 1831, and was eighteen months old at the time of his father's death. The United States is still a young country, and most readers have enough knowledge of pioneer life, either from experience or tradition, to see at a glance the main features of his external life: A log-house, a forest, plain fare and rough clothes, few books and papers, a pioneer district school, neighborhood meetings, loggings, raisings, "bees," hard work, pinching economy, an occasional visit to the neighboring villages or to Cleveland, come at once into view. Young Garfield's life did

not materially differ from the lives of other boys in the Orange woods. Naturally the Garfields, as they had lost the husband and father, fell behind most of their neighbors in property, so that their labor was more severe, and their poverty more pinching. Some attention must be paid to the early opening of his mind and the unfolding of his character.

Young James Garfield ranked high in the neighborhood in respect to ability, education, and character. He took the district-school course of study in the old-fashioned way: spelling, reading, writing, geography, grammar, and arithmetic. By the time that he was seventeen years old, he had learned what the district school could teach him. It does not appear that, up to this age, he had contemplated wider studies. This is a noticeable fact in the life of one who has so highly distinguished himself in the intellectual field. His passion was to go to sea and become a sailor. Had this passion been gratified, he might now be the captain of a Pacific whaler, or of an Atlantic steamer; he might even have found his way to a high place in the navy; but he would hardly have been a candidate for President of the United States.

This is a very slight account of the first period in General Garfield's life. His boyhood was in many respects remarkable. After relating an interesting political anecdote of Lord Melbourne, Mr. Bagehot says: "I can not vouch for its truth; Lord Melbourne's is a character about which men make stories." Something like this may be said of General Garfield's life, especially his early life. Men like to make and tell stories about it. But even when the fables have been torn away, plenty of the picturesque and romantic remains. Garfield the barefooted boy, the wood-chopper, the canal-boat driver, and the carpenter does not come within my range. *That* Garfield will be taken care of by the biographers. But here it may be said that his fierce struggle for existence was his first, and perhaps most valuable school. Poverty, self-denial, and hardy toil meted out to him their severe discipline. One has wisely said, "The man of culture is the man who has formed his ideals through labor and self-

denial." In this sense no one could be better cultured. In this school were formed his habits of application, of endurance, and of indomitable purpose. The familiar wood-chopping and canal-driving stories, which I have neither time nor desire to tell, have a three-fold significance: first, they reveal the nature of his early life; second, taken with his subsequent history, they show the power of the man; third, they teach that there is one country on the globe where a boy need not be born on the steps of the throne or in the seats of wealth to rise to distinguished place; but that the best which America has to offer is within the reach of the poor boy's brain and heart and hand.

CHAPTER II.

GARFIELD THE STUDENT: CHESTER, HIRAM, AND WILLIAMSTOWN.

"General Garfield, as a student, was one who would at any time impress himself upon the memory of his instructors by his manliness and excellence of character."—*President Chadbourne.*

How young Garfield's attention was turned in the direction of wider study, what his first studies of the wider order were, where and under what circumstances they were prosecuted, he has himself well told in a letter to the trustees of Geauga Seminary, at Chester, Ohio, written in 1867, and inclosing a contribution for renovating the seminary building at that place:

In accordance with your request, I will make a brief statement of my connection with Geauga Seminary. I do this with the more readiness because it is a source of great pleasure to me to recall the persons and scenes connected with the beginnings of my student life.

In the winter of 1848-'9 I was at my mother's house in Orange, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, suffering from a three months' siege of fever and ague, which I had brought from the Ohio canal the preceding summer. Samuel D. Bates, now a distinguished minister of the gospel in Marion, Ohio, was that winter teaching the district school near my mother's. He had attended the seminary at Chester, and urged several of the young men in the neighborhood to return there with him in the spring. Being yet too ill to return to my plan of becoming a sailor on the lake, I resolved to

attend school one term and postpone sailing until autumn. Accordingly, I joined two other young men, and, with the necessary provisions for boarding ourselves, we reached Chester March 6, 1849, and rented a room in an unpainted frame house nearly west from the seminary and across the street from it.

I bought the second algebra I ever saw, and commenced the study of it there. Studied also natural philosophy and grammar.

I attended there in the fall of 1849, and during the following winter taught my first school. Returned to the seminary again in the spring of 1850. I commenced the study of Latin and finished algebra and botany. At the close of the spring term I made my first public speech. It was a six minutes' oration at the annual exhibition. My diary shows the anxiety and solicitude through which I passed in its preparation and delivery.

During the summer vacation of 1850 I worked at the carpenter's trade in Chester. Among other things, I helped to build a two-story house on the east side of the road, a little way south of the seminary grounds. Attended school during the fall term of 1850, and commenced the study of Greek. Worked mornings, evenings, and Saturdays at my trade, and thus paid my way. After the first term at Chester I never received any pecuniary assistance. The cost of living, however, was much less than it now is. In my second term at Chester I had board, lodging, and washing for one dollar and six cents per week.

By this time, it was clear that James Garfield would not "run" on the canal nor sail the ocean; his mind had now got its proper direction. But morals and religion, not mental abilities and studies, are the basis of character. Hence it should be said that, from the first, he was honest, truthful, serious, and reverent. He had already made a public profession of religion, and united with the Disciples of Christ, of which body he has always remained a member. Members of the family belonged to the same body. In the fall of 1851 he found his way to the Western Reserve Eclectic Institute, at Hiram, Portage County, Ohio. As Hiram was the centre of his life from 1851 to 1877, it will be well to give a short account both of the place and of the school.

In 1850, when the Disciples planted their Institute there, Hiram was a township of Western Reserve farmers. The "Centre "

was a cross-roads, with two churches and half a dozen other buildings. The Institute building, a plain but substantially built brick structure, was put on the top of a windy hill in the middle of a corn-field. One of the cannon that General Scott's soldiers dragged to the city of Mexico in 1847, planted on the roof of the new structure, would not have commanded a score of farm-houses. The reasons that controlled the location of the school are not to us material. Here the school began at the time that Garfield was closing his studies at Chester. It had been in operation two terms when he offered himself for enrollment. Hiram furnished a location; the Board of Trustees, a building and the first teachers; the surrounding country, students; but the spiritual Hiram made itself. Everything was new. Society, traditions, the genius of the school, had to be evolved from the forces of the teachers and pupils, limited by the general and local environment. Let no one be surprised when I say, such a school as this was the best of all places for young Mr. Garfield. There was freedom, opportunity, a large society of rapidly and eagerly opening young minds, instructors who were learned enough to instruct him, and abundant scope for ability and force of character, of which he had a superabundance.

At first he found room for his activity in the double work of student and janitor; later, in the double work of student and teacher. Few of the students who came to Hiram in that day had more than a district-school education, though some had attended the high-schools and academies scattered over the country; so that Garfield, although he had made but slight progress in the classics and the higher mathematics previous to his arrival, ranked well up with the first scholars. In ability, all acknowledged that he was the peer of any; soon his superiority to all others was generally conceded. His mind was now reaching out in all directions; and all the more widely because the elastic course of study, and the absence of traditionary trammels, gave him room. He was a vast elemental force, and nothing was so essential as space and opportunity. Hiram was now forming her future teachers, as well as creating her own cul-

ture. Naturally, then, when he had been only one year in the school, he was given a place in the corps of teachers. In the catalogue of 1853-'4 his name appears both with the pupils and the teachers: "James A. Garfield, Cuyahoga County," and "J. A. Garfield, Teacher in the English Department and of the Ancient Languages." His admission to the Faculty page may be an index to a certain rawness in the school, but it gave to his talents and ambition the play that an older school with higher standards could not have afforded him. I shall not here speak of him as a teacher further than to say: in two years' service he had demonstrated his great ability in that capacity, had won the hearts of the students generally, and had wrought in the minds of the school authorities the conviction that his further services would be indispensable on his return from college. His letter quoted above shows that he had had some experience in teaching in a district school, before he went to Hiram.

Garfield had now been three years in Hiram. Some time before he had got beyond all the classes, and so was compelled to carry on his studies privately. While teaching five or six hours a day, he was doing more than a student's full work in course studies, not to speak of studies that were discursive, and of other outside work. He now took his Ohio training to an old seat of learning, Williams College, Massachusetts. If it had been well for him that his preparation had been made in a new western school, it was well that now he went to a New England college. His studies had been prosecuted with such vigor that he felt confident of his ability to finish the course in one year; but feeling his need of longer training, and of closer intimacy with eastern educators, he wisely concluded to devote two years to the work. Accordingly, he entered the junior class in the fall of 1854, and graduated with the highest honors in 1856. Besides what he had done for himself in the two years, he had made a lasting impression upon his fellow students and the faculty. The furrow plowed in college by most students, even strong ones, is soon effaced; but Hiram-prepared pupils who followed him to Williams years afterward, brought back the

report that Garfield was not forgotten, but was being closely watched by instructors and students alike as a "Williams man." On commencement day he gave the "Metaphysical Oration." He had received no pecuniary assistance since his first term at Chester. By careful economy he saved some money from his first Hiram earnings, this he carried to Williams, but he left college with a debt of five hundred dollars that had to be discharged. Before returning to Hiram Hill, the reader will be glad to read in this place this testimonial from one of Garfield's instructors, now the President of Williams College:

WILLIAMS COLLEGE, WILLIAMSTOWN,
MASSACHUSETTS, July 8, 1880

President B. A. Hinsdale:

MY DEAR SIR: Your note comes to me in the midst of the hurry of commencement week. I can only give in substance what I have stated in my speeches respecting General Garfield's character as a student in Williams College. He graduated in 1856, soon after I began my work here as professor. The students who came under my instruction then made a much stronger impression upon me than those of a later day, since my attention has been called to other interests than those of the lecture-room. But General Garfield, as a student, was one who would at any time impress himself upon the memory of his instructors by his manliness and excellence of character. He was one whom his teachers would never suspect as guilty of a dishonest or mean act, and one whom a dishonest or mean man would not approach. College life is, in some respects, a severe test of character. False notions of honor often prevail among students, so that, under sanction of "college custom," things are sometimes done by young men which they would scorn to do in other places. There was a manliness and honesty about General Garfield that gave him power to see and do what was for his own good and the honor of the college. His life as a student was pure and noble. His moral and religious character and marked intellectual ability gave great promise of success in the world. His course since he entered active life has seemed to move on in the same line in which he moved here. He has been distinguished for hard work, clear insight into great questions of public interest, strong convictions, and manly courage.

I know of no better example among our public men of success fairly won. With such a man as President, we might fairly expect that the

country would have an administration pure and honest in its purpose, and successful in all the affairs that the Executive could control.

Very truly yours,
P. A. CHADBOURNE.

CHAPTER III.

THE HIRAM TEACHER.

"Right proud are we the world should know
As hero him we long ago
Found truest helper, friend."

—*Mrs. E. C. Glasier.*

THE Hiram board had anticipated Mr. Garfield's return by electing him teacher of ancient languages and literature. After one year's service, being then twenty-six years old, he was made the head of the Institution with the title, Chairman of the Board of Instructors, and in 1858 he was made Principal in name as well as in fact. He held this office until he entered the army, in the fall of 1861, though compelled to resign his work to the hands of his associates, save such as he could do at Columbus or on his occasional visits home, while serving in the Ohio Senate, in the winters of 1859-'60 and 1860-'61. Even when he became a soldier, though it was apparent to all intelligent observers that Hiram school was too small a theatre for his activity, the board, wishing rather than hoping that he might return, determined at all events not to part with his name, kept him nominally at the head two years longer. In 1865 and 1866 he was Advisory Principal and Lecturer. Then his name finally disappeared from the Faculty page of the catalogue, but to stand to this day among the Trustees. Such is the chronology of his post-college connection with the Eclectic Institute. But I should be doing the public an injustice were I not to characterize him as a teacher and school administrator.

The Hiram catalogues from 1857 to 1861 show that the field of instruction was regularly allotted to the different instructors. But the published scheme was not fully carried out in practice. This was owing to a variety of causes. In the first place, a great majority of the students were irregular,

following no systematic courses of study. From its very nature the Hiram army could not take on a regular brigade and division organization, each group with its appropriate officer. Hence, the teachers were compelled to accommodate themselves to the wants of the school. But more, these teachers believed in breadth as well as in depth; and from choice they did what necessity also required, since in this way they would better avoid deep and narrow runs, keep their minds fresh and eager, as well as carry their individual methods and personal force through the whole school. Still, in general, each one worked within certain lines, though those lines were not very straight or rigid.

Mr. Garfield taught Latin, Greek, the higher mathematics, history, philosophy, English literature, English analysis, rhetoric, criticism, and occasionally one of the natural sciences. No man at the age of twenty-six or even thirty is profoundly versed in all these branches of learning, but his knowledge of them was fully adequate to all demands. Many young men and women were then preparing in Hiram for college, often going up to the junior, and occasionally to the senior year in their preparations. Students pursuing selected studies sometimes called for senior studies, and always found their demands satisfied. Though especially enthusiastic in particular lines of study and teaching, it was hard to see that Mr. Garfield did not teach Cæsar, Homer, geometry, English grammar, metaphysics, and geology equally well. On the whole, he perhaps took least interest in the mathematical studies; but among the others it would be hard to name his favorites. In fact, of all the branches of knowledge taught in a college, there was no one that did not at some time engage his special attention and awaken his enthusiasm. It is not beneath the dignity of history to record, that he always taught the class in English analysis, through which most of the better minds at some time passed; and that this study, often made dry and irksome, he clothed with light and filled with fire. Hundreds of eyes will kindle to-day at mention of "Garfield's Analysis Class." His weekly rhetorical class (called in Hiram phrase "Garfield's division"), with its es-

says, declamations, debates, and criticisms, was a great theatre of interest and improvement. His method of conducting a recitation was his own, combining the question that required a text-book answer, the topic to be handled, the call for the pupil's own opinion, and the teacher's discussion of the matter in hand. As a drill-master, many teachers surpassed him; but as an educator in the best sense, he stood with the first. His class-room glowed with life. Probably no pupil remembers having spent in it a dull hour. While placing its proper valuation upon learning and information, his great aim was to awaken the faculties of the student. There is a process known to the laboratory as *energizing a magnet*. By passing electrical currents around a bar of common iron, the electrician gives the bar magnetic virtue. There is an analogous process known to the educator; the most important work that he can render the student is to *energize him*. Among the teachers whom I have known, Garfield stood alone as an energizer of young men and women. He revealed the world to the student, and the student to himself. He called out thought, set the faculties in full play, awakened courage, widened the field of mental vision, and poured in abundant measures of inspiration.

In those days boys of ability and character often found their way to Hiram to take a few studies, but with no thought of pursuing an extended course of study. As their minds began to open, they began to reach out beyond the tether fixed by past education or present circumstances. Sometimes the fathers of these boys held them to the farm or the shop by the firm hand of parental counsel, or even of authority. Mr. Garfield was quick to find these boys out. He seemed to read them by intuition. He had had similar experiences. He knew a mind that was teeming with new facts, ideas, and impressions, and could enter into its daily struggle. He saw that these boys were capable of wider action than the farm or the shop, and he sought to lead them out into the broader field. He counseled and encouraged them, and sought in all ways to steady them in the transition from the old to the new. He carried his expostulations to the heart of the parent. He has been known to

say that he never found more pleasure than in "capturing boys." His conscious method was, to arouse a keen interest in the world of thought and learning, to interest them in the school, to place before them high ideals; his unconscious method, to pour into them his own spirit, and to attach them to himself. That he knew how to say the right word at the right time, is shown by the following quotation from a letter written in 1857 to a young district-school teacher who was then wrestling with his own life-question:

I am glad to hear of your success in teaching, but I approach with much more interest the consideration of the question you have proposed. Brother mine, it is not a question to be discussed in the spirit of debate, but to be thought over and prayed over as a question "out of which are the issues of life." You will agree with me that every one must decide and direct his own course in life, and the only service friends can afford is to give us the data from which we must draw our own conclusion and decide our course. Allow me, then, to sit beside you and look over the field of life and see what are its aspects. I am not one of those who advise every one to undertake the work of a liberal education; indeed, I believe that in two thirds of the cases such advice would be unwise. The great body of the people will be and ought to be (intelligent) farmers and mechanics, and in many respects these pass the most independent and happy lives. But God has endowed some of his children with desires and capabilities for a more extended field of labor and influence, and so every life should be shaped according to "what the man hath." Now, in reference to yourself, *I know* you have capabilities for occupying positions of high and important trust in the scenes of active life; and I am sure you will not call it flattery in me, nor egotism in yourself, to say so. Tell me, Burke, do you not feel a spirit stirring within you that longs *to know, to do, and to dare*, to hold converse with the great world of thought, and holds before you some high and noble object to which the vigor of your mind and the strength of your arm may be given? Do you not have longings like these, which you breathe to no one, and which you feel must be heeded, or you will pass through life unsatisfied and regretful? I am sure you have them, and they will for ever cling round your heart till you obey their mandate. They are the voice of that nature which God has given you, and which, when obeyed, will bless you and

your fellow men. Now all this might be true, and yet it might be your duty not to follow that course. If your duty to your father or your mother demands that you take another, I shall rejoice to see you taking that other course. The path of duty is where we all ought to walk, be that where it may. But I sincerely hope you will not, without an earnest struggle, give up a course of liberal study. Suppose you could not begin your study again till after your majority. It will not be too late then, but you will gain in many respects; you will have more maturity of mind to appreciate whatever you may study. You may say you will be too old to begin the course, but how could you better spend the earlier days of life? We should not measure life by the days and moments that we pass on earth.

"The life is measured by the soul's advance;
The enlargement of its powers; the expanded field
Wherein it ranges, till it burns and glows
With heavenly joy, with high and heavenly hope."

It need be no discouragement that you be obliged to hew your own way, and pay your own charges. You can go to school two terms every year, and pay your own way. I know this, for I did so when teachers' wages were much lower than they are now. It is a great truth that "where there is a will there's a way." It may be that by and by your father could assist you. It may be that even now he could let you commence on your own resources, so that you could begin immediately. Of this you know and I do not. I need not tell you how glad I should be to assist you in your work; but if you can not come to Hiram while I am here, I shall still hope to hear that you are determined to go on as soon as the time will permit.

Garfield's associates were able and effective teachers, respected and esteemed by the pupils; but those who had reached his zone always strained a point, if necessary, to be in at least one of his classes.

One of his most valuable offices was his morning lectures in chapel to all the scholars. In those days the term attendance at Hiram ranged from one hundred and eighty to three hundred students, covering a wide range of ability and education. He did not give a lecture every morning, but one or more series were expected every term. He had brought back from Williams the best thoughts of Dr. Mark Hopkins; in the fertile soil of his mind, these, as well as thoughts gathered from other sources, became the seeds of fresh

thoughts innumerable, and he sowed the harvest again with unstinted hand. He ranged over the fields of Bible history, morals, education, teaching, science, literature, practical affairs, history, and life questions. These lectures may not have been finished *ad unguem*; but they abounded in fresh facts, striking illustrations, and suggestive thoughts, and were warm with the breath of his own life. Occasionally he would give us from manuscript a finished address, colored more warmly, perhaps, than his mature taste would justify. In this exhilarating atmosphere, ethics and religion were not forgotten. Particular pains were taken to place before the students ideals of life and character nobly wrought, and instinct with courage, manliness, and truth. Though bounding with life and spirits himself, he was full of what Dr. Thomas Arnold called "moral thoughtfulness," and he strove to make his pupils temperate, morally serious, and reverent to truth.

He was eminently successful as a school administrator. He had nothing of the martinet or the regulation schoolmaster about him. He was not one of those who are great in little things. He perfectly understood what *was*, and what *was not*, essential to good order; and he secured the first all the easier because he was indifferent to the second. He had a code of formulated rules, sufficiently long and rigorous we boys thought, that he expected us to obey; but his own personality was worth far more as a controlling power than any rules could be. He was firm but kind, exacting but sympathetic. He was fully alive to the sentiment of justice, and respected, even in the most unworthy, human nature and human rights. Then, as since, he was full of appreciation and generosity.

Naturally, Garfield the teacher drew his pupils to himself with extraordinary power. Never have I seen such devotion to another teacher. An old Hiram student, now holding a responsible office in the public schools of Cleveland, speaking of the old times before Garfield went to college, says in a private letter: "Then began to grow up in me an admiration and love for Garfield that has never abated, and the like of which I have never known. A bow of recognition

or a single word from him was to me an inspiration." And such would be the general testimony. In all this there was method; not the method of crafty art, as the cynical might say, but the method of nature, the method of a great mind and a noble heart. I take my leave of this Hiram teacher with affirming my conviction that, other things being equal, General Garfield has never been greater than he was in Hiram from 1857 to 1861. He left the quiet of the academy for the roar of the field and the forum at the age of thirty years, but not until he had demonstrated his fitness for the highest educational work and honors.

It must not be supposed, however, that the field of his activity in those years has now been fully canvassed. With all the rest he was a preacher. As the Disciples were a new body, originating in a revolt from the old theological and ecclesiastical standards, they gave more room to personal force and inspiration than the older and more conventional churches. Presumably, he never intended to devote himself to the ministry. Certainly he did not after returning from college. He never had any other ordination from his brethren than their general approval and encouragement. From 1856 to 1861 his pulpit ministrations were in large request. Recalling his sermons at the distance of twenty years, I should say they were stronger in the ethical than in the theological and ecclesiastical elements. What is more, in 1858 he entered his name in a Cleveland law firm, as a student at law, but he carried on his studies by himself at Hiram. Then he lectured, with great acceptance, before popular audiences, on scientific, literary, educational, and moral topics. He was in great request as an instructor and lecturer at teachers' institutes. He became greatly interested in geology, and expounded the facts and principles of that science before numerous audiences. In the winter of 1859-'60, he was drawn into a public debate with a Mr. Denton, an anti-Christian and spiritualistic lecturer and debater. The subject was the development theory. That was before Mr. Darwin gave the evolution doctrine its new shaping, and the point of the discussion was the merits of development as it was left by Lamarck

and the author of the "Vestiges." All this time he was pushing his general studies in all directions. In college he had become interested in the German literature, and had contributed to the "Quarterly" an appreciative paper on the poet Körner. He now became more interested than ever in Germany and German topics. If it be true, as tradition asserts, that one of his ancestors was a German woman, the principle of heredity may explain his admiration of the German patience, thoroughness, and profundity. One of his old maxims, to be construed rhetorically, of course, is, that "hard work is the only genius"; a maxim that well describes the German mental habit. One of his lectures on Germany, I well remember, sent one pupil post-haste to the library in search of Motley's "Dutch Republic," a work just from Harper's press, that he had mentioned in his discourse.

But I must now leave Hiram village and school to follow its leading spirit into the world of wider action.

CHAPTER IV.

POLITICS AND THE OHIO SENATE.

UP to 1856 General Garfield had taken no particular interest in public affairs. He had been occupied with other matters. But now that his general education was finished, and he was ready to devote himself to the work of the world, his political pulses began to stir. A year or two before, the Republican party had sprung up as an immediate consequent of the Kansas-Nebraska legislation. Its original mission was thus stated by its present standard-bearer in his speech nominating Secretary Sherman at Chicago:

Long familiarity with traffic in the bodies and souls of men had paralyzed the consciences of a majority of our people. The baleful doctrine of State sovereignty had shaken and weakened the noblest and most beneficent powers of the National Government, and the grasping power of slavery was seizing the virgin territories of the West, and dragging them into the den of external bondage. At that crisis the Republican party was born. It drew its first inspiration from that fire of liberty which God has lighted in every

human heart, and which all the powers of ignorance and tyranny can never wholly extinguish. The Republican party came to deliver and save the Republic. It entered the arena where the beleaguered and assailed territories were struggling for freedom, and drew around it the sacred circle of liberty, which the demon of slavery has never dared to cross. It made them free for ever. Strengthened by its victory on the frontier, the young party, under the leadership of that great man who, on this spot twenty years ago, was made its leader, it entered the National Capital and assumed the high duties of government.

A young party with such aims as these could but appeal to his reason, his feelings, and his imagination. Even before leaving college he enrolled himself under the Republican banner. He cast his first vote that year. His graduation coincided with the nomination of John C. Fremont to the Presidency, and the story of the "Pathfinder" also awoke his interest and enthusiasm. He made some speeches that campaign in Hiram and the neighboring villages. Of course he was then a tyro in politics, but his speeches had the marks of his greatest later efforts. They were well reasoned, candid, earnest, and often eloquent. As the Republican platform then contained but one plank—resistance to the spread of slavery in the national territories—the central point of all his speeches was the constitutionality and rightness of the Wilmot proviso. Here was room to interpret the Constitution, to trace the legislation of Congress on the subject, to discuss the general character of slavery, and to mark the destructive consequences of its spread. At no time in our history, perhaps, has a stump orator had a better opportunity to make effective speeches. The national mind and conscience were awakening from their long slumber. Historical, logical, economical, and moral elements could be blended and fused in the appeal to the popular heart. Mr. Garfield soon rose to the level of the argument. The next year the field of his efforts was wider. He now became a recognized political force in the county, and even received calls to go beyond its borders. The year 1858 witnessed a still further growth of his power and influence. Likewise 1859. This year a Legislature was to be chosen; and, as naming the Republican candidate for Sen-

ator from the Portage-Summit district belonged to the first-named county, he was put forward as a candidate for the nomination. Other and older candidates were in the field, but after a spirited contest he was nominated. As the district was strongly Republican, he was elected as a matter of course. Thus, in three years from the making of his first political speech he found himself a Senator of Ohio. We are now to accompany him to the Senate-Chamber at Columbus.

When Mr. Garfield took his seat in the Chamber he was the youngest member of the body, being twenty-eight years old. He entered at once upon his new duties with the thoroughness, ability, and zeal that have characterized all his life, public and private. In the college literary society, and in various public assemblies, he had acquired a good knowledge of parliamentary law. This he now hastened to perfect. That he might the better know his fellow Senators in their district relations, he took a map of Ohio, marked off the senatorial districts by drawing lines around them with his pen, and then wrote each man's name on the face of his district. Some able men sat in that senate: General J. D. Cox and Hon. James Monroe, both since well known in the national service; Messrs. Harrison, Key, Schleigh, and others. The Portage Senator soon took rank as one of the best speakers on the floor. He was also a valuable man on committees and in party counsels. No Senator was more frequently called to his councils by the President of the Senate when knotty points of order were to be untied or cut. The Republicans were in the majority; but there were two kinds of Republicans, conservatives and radicals. Garfield, Cox, and Monroe have been called the "Radical triumvirate." Between the two sections of the party the passages-at-arms were sometimes as lively as between the Republicans and the Democrats. But, while a radical, his views and his sympathies were as broad then as now. A few days after the session of 1860 opened, the Legislatures and Executives of Tennessee and Kentucky met in Louisville, to celebrate the completion of the railroad that joins Louisville and Nashville. A resolution was carried through the Ohio Legislature

inviting these Tennesseans and Kentuckians to extend their visit to Columbus, at the expense of the State of Ohio. Our young Senator was the mover of the resolution, and he was sent to Louisville as chairman of the committee of invitation. His speech of invitation, delivered at the Louisville banquet in response to the toast to Ohio, was widely read and much admired at the time. Technically, it was what was then called a "Union-saving" speech; it is also a good sample of Garfield's early oratory. Only a short passage can be reproduced: "Brethren, we have too long heard of the North and the South. Their angry words have too long vexed the hearts of our fellow citizens. But there is a third voice to be heard ere long. I hope and believe the day is not far distant when the great West shall speak, and that voice shall be heard from sea to sea. In that voice shall be heard no terms of doubt or uncertainty; no note of disunion shall be heard in that utterance." Nor was this a mere bit of rhetoric. The orator meant it all. But, while he allowed no man to surpass him in devotion to the Union of sentiment and feeling, he also knew how to contend for the Union of the Constitution and the laws.

Ordinarily there is not much scope for statesmanship in an Ohio Legislature. But it so happened that Garfield sat in that one Legislature which, for a generation, opened the widest field to statesmanlike abilities, especially at its second session. With the presidential election of 1860 the war-cloud rose in the Southern sky. The great questions that were sprung by the secession ordinances of the Southern States, and the final issue of arms at Sumter, cast mere State questions into the shade. State legislators found themselves dealing with national questions. "Has a State a right to secede?" "Can a State be coerced?" "Shall Ohio be put in a state of preparation for war?" were some of the questions which absorbed the attention both of the Legislature and the public mind. It was a time when men's hearts were failing them for fear; prior to April 13, 1861, even the Northern mind had not got its set; but Mr. Garfield's course was straightforward and manly throughout. He was willing to yield anything that could

be yielded in safety and honor to allay Southern feeling; but he was not willing to yield the Union as a fact, or to pare away the integrity and the supremacy of the national authority. He thought the spring of 1861 an inopportune time to adopt the Corwin amendment to the Constitution, forbidding Congress ever to legislate upon slavery in the States. He opposed the meeting of the famous Washington Peace Commissioners until after President Lincoln should be inaugurated. To those who denied the right of the national Government to coerce a seceded State, he put the question: "Would you give up the forts and other government property in those States, or would you fight to maintain your right to them?" As a matter of course, he ardently supported the "Million Bill," and the other measures taken to prepare Ohio for the great contest of arms.

All of General Garfield's well-known characteristics as a legislator appeared in the Ohio Senate in 1860 and 1861. His effectiveness as a debater, and his thoroughness as a committee man, have already been mentioned. Withal, he was the student of law, politics, and government then that he is now. He spent most of his evenings to a late hour in the library, investigating questions that were before the Senate or the country, or, as was often the case, other questions in which he had become interested. He accumulated great bundles of notes and memoranda, many of which probably remain unused to this day. As chairman of committees, or as a special committee of one, he wrote and laid before the Senate several valuable reports. His report on the "Bill to define and punish treason against the State of Ohio" won for its author this compliment from Mr. Justice Swayne: "I should be very willing to put my name to that report." An able report on weights and measures is also deserving of mention.

This sketch of Garfield in the Ohio Senate must suffice. Any man can see that in this young Senator we have the future Congressman in brilliant promise. Before taking the next step in his life, I should remark that, the second winter at Columbus, he was examined for admission to the bar, and was admitted to practice in the courts of Ohio.

CHAPTER V.

GARFIELD THE SOLDIER.

"I found him to be a competent and efficient officer, an earnest and devoted patriot, and a man of the highest honor."—*General Rosecrans.*

THE part that Mr. Garfield took in preparing Ohio for the war has been shown in the sketch of his career in the Senate. From the first, he was ready to adjourn any old plans of his own, and to enter the army in person, provided his services should be needed. He so informed the authorities at Columbus. Returning from the Senate to Hiram, he aided in bringing to a successful close the school work of the year 1860-'61. The first battle of Bull Run, fought July 21, 1861, destroyed the confidence of the last man in Mr. Seward's "ninety-days" prophecies, and revealed to the most skeptical that the rebellion could not be put down without a war. July 27th, Governor Dennison addressed the Senator at Hiram, stating that he was organizing some new regiments, and asking Garfield if he would take a lieutenant-colonelcy in one of them. Returning home, August 7th, from a few weeks' absence, he found the Governor's letter awaiting him. He immediately replied that he would take the place, if still open, provided the regiment was to have a West Point colonel. Receiving a favorable reply, he went to Columbus the 15th, and on the 16th was mustered into the service as a lieutenant-colonel. The same day he reported at Camp Chase to General Hill for such duty as might be assigned, "in connection with a temporary command, for purposes of instruction in camp duty and discipline." This was the beginning of a military career of two years and three months; a career, it is believed, that was as able and distinguished as that of any volunteer officer in the war.

After a few weeks of duty at Camp Chase, he was detailed to recruit the Forty-second regiment of Ohio volunteers. Succeeding in this service, he was commissioned Colonel of the regiment, September 5th. This promotion was wholly unsolicited. His qualifications for the office were his great and versatile abilities, and such knowledge of

military science and art as he had gained by assiduous study in the months that had elapsed since the conflict of arms began. He now set to work to prepare his command for active duty. On December 14th, the regiment was ordered by General Buell, commanding the Department of the Ohio, to proceed with dispatch to Prestonburg, Kentucky. At nine o'clock p. m. the next day it was in Cincinnati. Here, in obedience to further orders, Colonel Garfield sent the regiment by boat to the mouth of the Big Sandy River, and then took the cars to Louisville to report to General Buell. To quote from Captain F. H. Mason's history of the Forty-second Regiment: *

On the evening of the 16th, Colonel Garfield reached Louisville and sought General Buell at his headquarters. He found a cold, silent, austere man, who asked a few direct questions, revealed nothing, and eyed the new comer with a curious, searching expression, as though trying to look into the untried Colonel, and divine whether he would succeed or fail. Taking a map, General Buell pointed out the position of Marshall's forces in eastern Kentucky, marked the location in which the Union troops in that district were posted, explained the nature of the country and its supplies, and then dismissed his visitor with the remark: "If you were in command of the sub-department of eastern Kentucky, what would you do? Come here to-morrow morning at nine o'clock and tell me." Colonel Garfield returned to his hotel, procured a map of Kentucky, the last census report, paper, pen, and ink, and sat down to his task. He studied the roads, resources, and population of every county in eastern Kentucky. At daylight he was still at work, but at nine o'clock he was at General Buell's headquarters with a sketch of his plans. Buell read it and made it the basis of his Special Order No. 35, Army of the Ohio, December 17, 1861, by which the Eighteenth Brigade, Army of the Ohio, was organized.

The forces constituting the brigade were four regiments of infantry, and several squadrons of cavalry. Order No. 35 directed the Colonel commanding the brigade to proceed to the valley of the Big Sandy River, and to repel the rebels then invading the valley in force under the command of General Humphrey Marshall. The duty assigned

was difficult and responsible; and that General Buell should assign it to a volunteer officer having no knowledge of war, save what he had gathered in a few weeks' time, may well excite surprise. The explanation is, in part, the scarcity in those days of experienced officers; and, for the rest, the extraordinary confidence in his abilities and character with which General Garfield, all his life, has inspired men with whom he has come into contact. That memorandum submitted at Louisville, the morning of December 17th, convinced the cold, silent, austere Buell of Garfield's fitness to command.

The history of the Sandy Valley campaign can not be given here save in the most general terms. While Garfield's main force moved up the river, one regiment struck across the country from Paris toward Prestonburg. Early in January, a junction of the forces was effected high up the valley, and on the 10th they were in front of Marshall's entire force, prepared stubbornly to resist their further advance. The battle of Middle Creek followed, in which Marshall, though his forces largely outnumbered Garfield's, to say nothing of his defensive position, was defeated. The rebel General abandoned his position, burned his stores and camp furniture, and began a retreat that did not end until he reached Abingdon, Virginia. After this victory, to clear the valley of the rebels was an easy task.

Compared with the stupendous operations of after days, this campaign seems a trifling affair; but it was widely heralded at the time, its success gave Union men everywhere great cheer, and it proved that there was in the Ohio school-teacher and Senator the making of a soldier. Garfield's success, both in the campaign and in the battle, was due to the audacity of inexperience as well as to his able handling of the forces when once the venture had been made. He said afterward: "It was a very rash and imprudent affair on my part. If I had been an officer of more experience, I probably should not have made the attack. As it was, having gone into the army with the notion that fighting was our business, I didn't know any better." His success makes one wonder what might have happened if the commanders of the great armies, east and west, in

those gloomy winter days of 1861-'62, had shown some of the same rashness and imprudence! The battle of Middle Creek starts some curious thoughts, considered from another standpoint. A well-known memorandum of General McDowell's relates that, at eight o'clock the evening of January 10, 1862, he was closeted with President Lincoln at the White House. General Franklin, Secretaries Seward and Chase, and the Assistant Secretary of War were also present. To quote McDowell's memorandum: *

The President was greatly disturbed at the state of affairs. Spoke of the exhausted condition of the treasury; of the loss of public credit; of the Jacobinism of Congress; of the delicate condition of our foreign relations; of the bad news he had received from the West, particularly as contained in a letter from General Halleck on the state of affairs in Missouri; of the want of cooperation between Generals Halleck and Buell; but more than all, the sickness of General McClellan. The President said he was in great distress, and as he had been to General McClellan's house and the General did not ask to see him, and as he must talk to somebody, he had sent for General Franklin and myself to obtain our opinion as to the possibility of soon commencing active operations with the Army of the Potomac. To use his own expression, if something was not soon done, the bottom would be out of the whole affair; and if General McClellan did not want to use the army, he would like to *borrow it*, provided he could see how it could be made to do something.

In those days, events that we now deem of slight importance often made an extraordinary impression upon men's minds; and one can not help wondering what the effect on that small circle of men would have been, especially on the President, had the news been flashed to them that an Ohio school-master, with an inferior force, had just defeated a rebel general, and was at that hour pursuing him in the woods of eastern Kentucky!

Taken in its connections, the Sandy Valley campaign was not of slight importance. Marshall's force was one of the two rebel armies planted on General Buell's left flank to prevent his advancing against Bowling Green. The other was Zollicoffer's force,

* "Ohio in the War," vol. i, p. 675.

defeated by General Thomas at Mill Springs. The defeat of two armies not only cleared a large part of the State of the Confederates, but, with the operations of Foote and Grant in another quarter, left Buell free to begin operations in central Kentucky. In fact, the rebels did not wait for Buell's attack, but fell back on Nashville, and then beyond that city. What is more, Middle Creek was the first of the victories that won so much territory from the enemy, and also did so much to tone up the Union mind in the spring of 1862: Middle Creek, Mill Springs, Fort Henry, Island No. 10, and Memphis. In a warm congratulatory order, General Buell spoke of the Valley campaign as "calling into action the highest qualities of a soldier—fortitude, perseverance, courage." The authorities at Washington made the Colonel who had conducted it a Brigadier-General of Volunteers, dating his commission January 10, 1862. As he had been the youngest man in the Ohio Senate two years before, so now he was the youngest General in the army.

This work finished, General Garfield was ordered to leave a small force at Piketon, to hold the Sandy Valley, and then to transfer the rest of the command to Louisville. There the Eighteenth Brigade was assigned to the command of General G. W. Morgan, destined for service at Cumberland Gap. Its old commander was directed to join General Buell, who, with the Army of the Ohio, was then beyond Nashville, hastening to effect a junction with Grant at Pittsburg Landing before Grant should be struck by the rebel General Johnston. Overtaking the army thirty miles beyond Columbia, he was assigned to the command of the Twentieth Brigade, then a part of General Wood's division. It has seemed fitting to mark with some detail and distinctness the entry of General Garfield into the army, and his first soldier experience. For the next ten months his services must be summed up in a paragraph.

With his command, he reached the field of Shiloh early in the afternoon of the second day of the battle, and contributed to the final repulse of the enemy. The next day he moved with Sherman to the front, and shared in a sharp engagement with the

rear guard of the retreating army. Later, he participated in the operations before Corinth, and his command was among the first to enter that town on its evacuation by Beauregard. Then he was given the duty of rebuilding the bridges and reopening the railroad between Corinth and Decatur. Crossing the Tennessee at Decatur, he made his headquarters at Huntsville, Alabama, the rest of the campaign. Here he served on several courts-martial, notably the one that tried General Turchin. By this time it was midsummer, and the intense heat, malarial atmosphere, and hard work, together with a tendency to fever and ague, contracted on the canal years before, brought on a severe attack of that disease.

About the first of August, he went home on sick-leave. At the same time Secretary Stanton, who had a high opinion of him, ordered Garfield to Cumberland Gap to succeed Morgan in that command. He was unable to leave his bed, and could not go. In obedience to further orders, he reported in person to the Secretary late in September, 1862. October 25th, he was detailed as a member of the Court of Inquiry created to investigate the case of General McDowell. November 8th, he was ordered to report for duty to General Hunter, to take part in a projected expedition to South Carolina. As the second of these orders superseded the first, so a third soon superseded the second. November 25th, he was detailed as a member of the General Court-martial for the trial of General Fitz John Porter. On this court he served during its sessions. General Hunter, who was the President of the court, greatly desired that Garfield might be assigned to his command in the South; but an official order, dated January 14, 1863, sent him to the Army of the Cumberland, then under the command of General Rosecrans. He reached Rosecrans's headquarters, at Murfreesboro, near the end of February, 1863. From this time till the close of his army life, we must proceed more slowly.

General Rosecrans had won a brilliant victory at Stone River in the preceding December. His army had suffered so heavily in men and in material that, the battle over, it stood in need of almost complete reorganization. When General Garfield arrived

at headquarters, the work on hand was the preparation of the army for offensive operations. The commanding General offered him his choice: to command a brigade or to be Chief of the Staff of the Army. There had been no chief of staff since a cannon-shot carried away the head of Garesché, the 30th of December previous. Finally, he decided in favor of the latter, and Rosecrans accordingly issued the appropriate order, February 28th. General Garfield immediately entered upon his new duties, and, before he left the army in September following, he had come to have more influence over his commander than any other man in the army. Early in the spring he directed Captain D. G. Swaim, his adjutant, to organize a Bureau of Military Information. "By a system of police and secret reports," says Captain Mason, "very full and trustworthy information was obtained of the organization, strength, and position of the enemy's forces." The Captain adds that "this bureau was the most perfect machine of the kind organized during the war." General Rosecrans was a man of brilliant mind; he had also eminent soldier qualities; but he was sensitive, absorbed in details, given to asperities, and had a fatal faculty for getting into complications with the military authorities at Washington. His Chief of Staff labored to the utmost, and with some success, to bring about and preserve a better understanding. He saw that the organization of the army was defective; that two of the corps commanders were wholly unfit for their places; and he strove without success to have these commanders superseded by capable men. From January to June the Army of the Cumberland lay at Murfreesboro. The President and War Secretary insisted that it should move. General Garfield added his urgency to theirs; but Rosecrans said he was not ready, and that an offensive movement would be hazardous. Unfortunately, most of the leading generals supported him in this opinion; and when he called on the corps, division, and cavalry generals for their opinion, not one out of the seventeen concurred with Garfield. The information that came to Garfield by way of Swaim's bureau, satisfied him that the time for a great blow was

most opportune. Accordingly, he took the seventeen letters written by the generals, collated them, summarized their substance, supplemented the whole by a cogent argument supporting his own opinion, and carried the document to the Commanding General of the Army.

Mr. Whitelaw Reid, in his "Ohio in the War," ventures to pronounce this report "the ablest military document submitted by a chief of staff to his superior during the war."* After looking over the whole field of the army's operations, counting the forces of all arms, and describing their equipment, as well as mustering the rebel army and gauging its power, he declares that, leaving behind all the troops that were necessary to hold the works at Murfreesboro, "there will be left 65,137 bayonets and sabers to throw against Bragg's 41,680." He "begs leave also to submit the following considerations," which are given as exhibiting the fullness of his information of the subject in hand, the sweep of his mind, and the courage of his opinions: †

1. Bragg's army is now weaker than it has been since the battle of Stone River, or is likely to be again for the present, while our army has reached its maximum strength, and we have no right to expect reinforcements for several months, if at all.

2. Whatever be the result at Vicksburg, the determination of its fate will give large reinforcements to Bragg. If Grant is successful, his army will require many weeks to recover from the shock and strain of his late campaign, while Johnston will send back to Bragg a force sufficient to insure the safety of Tennessee. If Grant fails, the same result will inevitably follow, so far as Bragg's army is concerned.

3. No man can predict with certainty the result of any battle, however great the disparity in numbers. Such results are in the hands of God. But, viewing the question in the light of human calculation, I refuse to entertain a doubt that this army, which in January last defeated Bragg's superior numbers, can overwhelm his present greatly inferior forces.

4. The most unfavorable course for us that Bragg could take would be to fall back without giving us battle; but this would be very disastrous to him. Besides the loss of *matériel* of war and the abandonment of the rich and abundant har-

* Vol. i, p. 752.

† Ibid., pp. 753-756.

vest now nearly ripe in Middle Tennessee, he would lose heavily by desertion. It is well known that a widespread dissatisfaction exists among his Kentucky and Tennessee troops. They are already deserting in large numbers. A retreat would greatly increase both the desire and the opportunity for desertion, and would very materially reduce his physical and moral strength. While it would lengthen our communications, it would give us possession of McMinnville, and enable us to threaten Chattanooga and East Tennessee; and it would not be unreasonable to expect an early occupation of the former place.

5. But the chances are more than even that a sudden and rapid movement would compel a general engagement, and the defeat of Bragg would be in the highest degree disastrous to the rebellion.

6. The turbulent aspect of politics in the loyal States renders a decisive blow against the enemy at this time of the highest importance to the success of the Government at the polls and in the enforcement of the Conscription act.

7. The Government and the War Department believe that this army ought to move upon the enemy. The army desires it, and the country is anxiously hoping for it.

8. Our true objective point is the rebel army, whose last reserves are substantially in the field; and an effective blow will crush the shell, and soon be followed by the collapse of the rebel government.

9. You have, in my judgment, wisely delayed a general movement hitherto, till your army could be massed and your cavalry could be mounted. Your mobile force can now be concentrated in twenty-four hours, and your cavalry, if not equal in numerical strength to that of the enemy, is greatly superior in efficiency. For these reasons I believe an immediate advance of all our available forces is advisable, and, under the providence of God, will be successful.

This paper was irresistible. General Rosecrans said the army must move, and a few days later opened the Tullahoma campaign, which Mr. Reid describes as a campaign* "perfect in its conception, excellent in its general execution, and only hindered from resulting in the complete destruction of the opposing army by the delays which had too long postponed its commencement."

It is proper to say that, at the opening of the campaign, the generals were still in-

credulous; and that General Crittenden, the morning the advance began, actually rode up to Garfield's tent, as Garfield was putting on his rubber coat preparatory to mounting his horse, and said, in the manner that had marked his father, Senator Crittenden: "It is understood, sir, by the general officers of the army, that this movement is your work. I wish you to understand that it is a rash and fatal movement, for which you will be held responsible."

The author of this text-book thought that he noticed a bit of pardonable pride in Garfield when, in giving a history of this campaign in his Hiram library a few weeks later, he said: "I had the satisfaction of having these generals acknowledge, at the end of the campaign, that they were wrong and that I was right."

Tullohama reached, General Rosecrans again delayed, and the old difficulties with the War Department again sprang up. But the advance on Chattanooga finally began. Sending two or three brigades to occupy the attention of the enemy in front of that town, Rosecrans, with the main body of the army, crossed the Tennessee some distance lower down, and struck the line of Bragg's communication with the country in his rear. The rebel General evacuated the town, and marched rapidly up the valley of Chickamauga Creek, to prevent his being crushed between Rosecrans's army and the river. Through the incompetence of one of the corps commanders, a day or two was lost to the main army, thereby enabling Bragg to escape the immediate blow prepared for him. The Union General now concentrated his forces; the rebel General gathered in every available reinforcement; and, on the 19th of September, the great battle of Chickamauga began. We are here interested in this two days' conflict only as concerns General Garfield. He performed to the full the duties of his position as Chief of Staff, and much more. It is said that he wrote every general order except one, and that one was the order which, based on false information, clumsily worded, and too literally obeyed, gave the enemy an immediate advantage. A gap was made in the line; Longstreet hurled a division through the opening; and in one short hour the whole right wing

* Ibid., p. 756.

of the army dissolved into a mob of fugitives, bearing the General and his staff with them in their flight toward Chattanooga. To check the retreat was impossible. Believing that defeat had also overtaken the other wing, General Rosecrans pushed on to Chattanooga to rally the army at that point. But his Chief of Staff, confident that the left was still holding its ground, sought and obtained permission to ride across the country in quest of General Thomas. The ride was perilous and full of exciting incidents. An orderly was killed by his side; his horse was hit. He found the "Rock of Chickamauga" unmoved. He communicated information of what had happened, and then acted under the orders of Thomas the rest of that bloody day. The heroic remnant of the army repulsed every attack.

As the baffled enemy fell back at night-fall, in company with General Granger Garfield supervised the shooting of a battery of six "Napoleons," and saw them discharged after the rebels as they plunged into the woods and darkness. What subsequently befell the army and its General are well-known matters of history. In a few days General Garfield was sent to Washington as bearer of dispatches, and to explain matters to the War Department. In Washington he met Secretary Stanton, who told him that he had been made a Major-General of Volunteers, "for gallant and meritorious services at the battle of Chickamauga." For reasons soon to appear, December 3, 1863, in the city of Washington, he resigned his commission. The period of his military service had been two years, three months, and nineteen days. Leave is taken of Garfield the soldier without characterizing his services further than to repeat, no officer in the volunteer service more distinguished himself in the whole war. The facts as related speak for themselves.

We are now to follow him to that theatre of activity where he has performed his most valuable public work. First, however, we must note the causes that led him from the martial to the civic field. In the summer of 1862, a large number of active Republicans in the Nineteenth Ohio Congressional District, by a spontaneous impulse, brought General Garfield forward as a candidate for

Congress. This movement was in no sense inspired by himself, nor did he give the canvass personal attention. He was nominated, and, as the district was overwhelmingly Republican, he was elected in October by a large majority. His election had no immediate effect on the soldier, as we have seen. In fact, more than half of his military life lies on this side of his election to Congress. Besides, it is proper to mention some facts concerning his leaving the army.

The pay of a Major-General was double the salary of a Congressman; he was poor and needed the money; his soldier career thus far had been far more successful than he could have hoped; he was young, popular in the army, stood high at Washington, and could confidently look forward to more distinguished service. From this point of view, the change was an act of self-denial. But there was great need of intelligent legislators at Washington, especially on military affairs; his brother officers told him that he could be more useful to the army in Congress than in the camp; President Lincoln added his urgent persuasion; besides, he could hardly disappoint those who had elected him. He took leave of his companions in arms with much reluctance. Immediately on resigning his Major-General's commission, he took his seat in the House of Representatives, of which body he has continued a member to this day.

CHAPTER VI.

CONGRESSMAN GARFIELD.

"Since the year 1864, you can not think of a question which has been debated in Congress, or discussed before the great tribunal of the American people, in regard to which you will not find, if you wish instruction, the argument on one side stated, in almost every instance better than by anybody else, in some speech made in the House of Representatives or on the hustings by Mr. Garfield."—*Hon. G. F. Hoar.*

To ninety-nine men out of every hundred who served in the Union army, military service was a great surprise. The United States had been a great theatre of civil but not of military activity; and the idea that they should become soldiers had never oc-

curred to these men until the call to arms rang in their ears. To them, service in the army, at the very least, meant either a postponement or an entire breaking up of such plans of life as they had formed. General Garfield was one of the ninety-nine. What his plans for the future were in 1860 I do not know, further than I infer them from his antecedents. Probably he would have entered upon a legal, as he had already entered upon a political career. One can not help speculating what his life would have been had he never been a soldier. For myself, I must hold the opinion that it would not have been greatly different. Probably he would have seen more of the law-office and the court-room than he now has; but that he would have had a great political career, I can not doubt. The character of his mind, the drift of his ambition, the nature of his studies, and the success of his entry into politics in 1856-'60 are the pledges of this opinion. I do not mean that he would have consciously sought public preferment. It would have come to him, as in fact it always has come, without his seeking. The most that I am willing to allow is, that his military services probably hastened his entry into national politics, and, without his striving to make them so, have been to him a strong element of political power.

But, dismissing curious speculations, I am now to follow General Garfield through his national political life. Considering the length of this career, and the great range and value of his civil activities, it must be said that his public services as teacher, and even as soldier, are small in comparison. His great path the last seventeen years will now be distinctly marked out.

I.

Thirty-eighth Congress, 1863-'65

When Mr. Garfield entered the House of Representatives, a class of men, most of whom have since disappeared, were in full ascendancy in both parties. The Republican leaders were men who had borne able and honorable parts in the great debate on the subject of slavery; of this subject they were masters. But as they had chiefly spent their political activity in attack, in opposi-

tion to the forces long in possession of the Government, as a class they were not strong in constructive statesmanship, especially on the great questions that are uppermost to-day. Death has removed many of these illustrious men, but others have fallen out of public life because of their non-adaptation to the new era. It was for the great changes that began with the advent of the Republican party to power—the war, reconstruction, and the adjustment of the government to the new order of things growing out of the war—to introduce to the country a new order of public men, viz., men whose political characters were formed, not so much by the slavery debate in the days of opposition, as by the series of tremendous events beginning in April, 1861. In the Thirty-eighth Congress the new men began to appear in public affairs. Mr. Garfield was one of the new men. His political opinions have been largely formed, and his political character matured, in wrestling with the great questions of the last seventeen years. In all respects he is one of the foremost men, if not *the* foremost man, of the new generation of statesmen.

On Mr. Garfield's entry into the House, the Speaker very naturally and properly put him on the Military Committee, of which Hon. R. C. Schenck was chairman. Mr. Garfield was the fourth in order on the Committee, but in ability and usefulness he ranked next to the chairman himself.

In December, 1863, the Nation was in the agony of the war. Vicksburg and Gettysburg were indeed behind, but the great operations that were to crush the rebellion were yet before. Ordinarily, the Committee of Ways and Means (especially before the former duties of that Committee were distributed among the Ways and Means, Appropriations, and Banking and Currency Committees) is the most important in the House; but it was not so in 1863. Then the Military Committee, in importance and conspicuousness, ranked all others, and a place on it was considered desirable by the ablest and most ambitious members.

It will be impossible to particularize all of General Garfield's services to the army in committee and on the floor. Any man who will take pains to go through "The Globe,"

from December 5, 1863, to March 4, 1865, will at once assent to the statement that the Army and the War Department had no more intelligent and zealous co-worker in the House. His name is identified with every important measure. Some of his most important services must receive the prominence here that they have in the history of the country.

It was the onerous duty of the Military Committee to originate measures to keep the army fully recruited, as it was of the Ways and Means to provide money, the other sinew of war. Popular as was the war for the Union in the beginning, magnificent as was the patriotism of the American people from first to last, it early became apparent that volunteering alone, even when stimulated by liberal bounties, would not furnish the number of men required to preserve the Union. More stringent measures must be taken. But in a democratic country like the United States, wholly unfamiliar with military conscription, still more in a country where the States had always been so prominent in the wars that the Nation had been engaged in, the enactment and enforcement of an efficient draft law by the national authority was confessedly difficult. The opponents of the war would promptly seize hold of the very attempt at recruiting by the draft as a weapon with which to attack the Administration; while all those Union men who were fearful of endangering their own seats in Congress, or of sacrificing popular approval, favored the feeblest policy that they thought would meet the emergency. However, a law for drafting was enacted by Congress, March 3, 1863. Perhaps it was as vigorous a measure as, at the time, the public would support. But before Congress met the next winter, it was clear to the authorities, and to all discerning and impartial men, that it was wholly inadequate to the wants of the Nation. In the first place, some dozen classes of exemptions were made; and, in the second, any drafted man could relieve himself from the service on paying three hundred dollars commutation. The Thirty-eighth Congress, at its first session, had to face the question, "What shall be done to fill up the army?"

The first answer was a resolution introduced by the Military Committee, January

6, 1864, proposing to meet the case by the payment of bounties. This was a very popular measure; popular with the people, with the army, and with Congress; popular with all these classes for very different though very obvious reasons. The vote stood one hundred and twelve to two. The two "noes" were given by Mr. Garfield and Mr. Grinnell of Iowa. Mr. Garfield stated the reasons which governed him in voting, in this speech:

Mr. Speaker: I regret that I was not able to meet with the Military Committee when this resolution was under consideration. I did not reach the city until a few hours before the House met this morning; but if I understand the matter correctly from the public journals, the request of the President and the War Department was to continue the payment of bounties until the 1st of February next; but the resolution before the House proposes to extend the payment until the 1st of March. And while the President asks us to continue the payment of bounties to veteran volunteers only, the resolution extends it to all volunteers, whether veterans or raw recruits. If the resolution prevails, it seems to me we shall swamp the finances of the Government before the 1st of March arrives. I can not consent to a measure which authorizes the expenditure of so vast a sum as will be expended under this resolution, unless it be shown absolutely indispensable to the work of filling up the army. I am anxious that veterans should volunteer, and that liberal bounties should be paid to them. But if we extend the payment to all classes of volunteers for two months to come, I fear we shall swamp the Government. Before I vote for this resolution, I desire to know whether the Government is determined to abandon the draft. If it be its policy to raise an army solely by volunteering and paying bounties, we have one line of policy to pursue. If the conscription law is to be anything but a dead letter on the statute book, our line of policy is a very different one. I ask the gentleman from Illinois to inform me what course is to be adopted. I am sorry to see in this resolution the indication of a timid and vacillating course. It is unworthy the dignity of our Government and our army to use the conscription act as a scarecrow, and the bounty system as a bait, to alternately scare and coax men into the army. Let us give liberal bounties to veteran soldiers who may reenlist, and for raw recruits use the draft

This speech and vote exhibited not only great foresight, but also great courage. Mr.

Garfield stood in opposition to his party, and even to his own Committee. It is reported that Secretary Chase, in a private conversation a few days later, told the young legislator that the vote was right, that he was proud of it, but admonished Garfield that it was a risky thing to vote against one's whole party, and was not to be done very often.

The logic of events was swift to vindicate both the speech and the vote of January 6th. Mr. Lincoln took the very unusual step of going to the Capitol to confer with a committee. He told the Committee, what he said he did not dare tell the public, that the army then numbered 750,000 men; that in one hundred days 380,000 would be discharged by the expiration of their terms of enlistment; and he declared that, unless the places of the 380,000 could be filled immediately, not only could the war not be pushed, but Sherman must be recalled from Atlanta and Grant from the Peninsula. He said: "I ask you to give me the power to draft men to fill the ranks." Some of the Republican members remonstrated, and reminded Mr. Lincoln that such a measure would endanger their return to the House, and his own reflection. Raising his tall figure to its full height, and his great mind to the level of the sublime, the President said: "Gentlemen, it is not necessary that I should be reelected; but it is necessary that I should put down this rebellion. If you will give me this law, I will put it down before my successor takes his seat." A bill embodying the President's ideas was prepared, and reported to the House. The first and most important section was struck out by a vote of one hundred to fifty. After further debate, Mr. Garfield moved to strike out the third and fourth sections, saying, as he did so:

The bill, as my colleague on the Committee has said, was presented as a whole; it is a measure that had no value in it, except the last two sections, unless taken as a whole. The heart is cut out of it, and the head cut off, and, with the exception of those two sections, I have not only no desire that it should pass, but I believe the mangled trunk would be a deformity, and would seriously injure the efficiency of the present law. We come before the House to say that the Presi-

dent had informed us, what our own examination of the state of the country also led us to believe, that the Government is in want of men, and not of money, to fill the ranks of its army; that the law we have given to the President and the War Department has in the main failed to secure the requisite reinforcements

It is no longer a question that we can not retain the commutation clause of the Enrollment act and at the same time fill up the army so as to supply the waste of battle.

Gentlemen, this Congress must sooner or later meet the issue face to face, and I believe the time will soon come, if it has not now come, when we must give up the war or give up the commutation. I believe the men and the Congress that shall finally refuse to strike out the commutation clause, but retain it in its full force as it now is, will substantially vote to abandon the war. And I am not ready to believe, I will not believe, that the Thirty-eighth Congress has come to that conclusion.

This was the 21st of June. The measure came up again a few days later. Mr. Garfield now made one of the strongest and most effective speeches that he has ever made in Congress. It never appeared in pamphlet form, but it can be found in "The Globe" for June 21, 1864. After briefly reviewing the action of the House, he said:

Mr. Speaker: It has never been my policy to conceal a truth *merely* because it is unpleasant. It may be well to smile in the face of danger, but it is neither well nor wise to let danger approach unchallenged and unannounced. A brave nation, like a brave man, desires to see and measure the perils which threaten it. It is the right of the American people to know the necessities of the Republic when they are called upon to make sacrifices for it. It is this lack of confidence in ourselves and the people, this timid waiting for events to control us when they should obey us, that makes men oscillate between hope and fear; now in the sunshine of the hill-tops, and now in the gloom and shadows of the valley. To such men the bulletin which heralds success in the army gives exultation and high hope; the evening dispatch announcing some slight disaster to our advancing columns brings gloom and depression. Hope rises and falls by the accidents of war, as the mercury of the thermometer changes by the accidents of heat and cold. Let us rather take for our symbol the sailor's barometer, which faithfully forewarns him of the tempest, and

gives him unerring promise of serene skies and peaceful seas.

He then went on to state the grounds for anxiety and apprehension. He gave a condensed and vivid statement of the efforts and sacrifices made by England in the great wars with Napoleon; next he spoke of the struggles of the Revolutionary fathers in the war of Independence; he drew a further lesson in courage, thoroughness, and devotion from the very rebels who were striving to destroy the Government. He then asserted the right of the Nation to the money of the citizen: "Coercion accompanies the tax-gatherer at every step." He also asserted her right to the citizen's service: "Every nation under heaven claims the right to order its citizens into the ranks as soldiers." This is his stirring peroration:

I ask gentlemen who oppose this repeal, why they desire to make it easy for citizens to escape from military duty? Is it a great hardship to serve one's country? Is it a disgraceful service? Will you, by your action here, say to the soldiers in the field, "This is a disreputable business; you have been deceived; you have been caught in the trap, and we will make no law to put anybody else in it"? Do you thus treat your soldiers in the field? They are proud of their voluntary service, and, if there be one wish of the army paramount to all others, one message more earnest than all the others which they send back to you, it is that you will aid in filling up their battle-thinned ranks by a draft which will compel lukewarm citizens who prate against the war to go into the field. They ask that you will not expend large bounties in paying men of third-rate patriotism, while they went with no other bounty than that love of country to which they gave their young lives a free offering, but that you will compel these eleventh-hour men to take their chances in the field beside them. Let us grant their request, and, by a steady and persistent effort, we shall, in the end, be it near or remote, be it in one year or ten, crown the Nation with victory and enduring peace.

Largely as the result of this speech, the bill was carried; with the concurrence of the Senate and the signature of the President it became a law, and the army was soon recruited. The "victory and enduring peace" promised by the orator soon followed.

As before remarked, the action of Gen-

eral Garfield in this matter argues not only foresight but unusual courage. He was at once assailed by some of the popular organs. His own district was deeply aroused by his votes and speeches. Sincerely thinking that the draft law of 1864 was both arbitrary and oppressive, loyal citizens poured in upon him indignant denunciation. His courage stood out all the bolder from the fact that his own renomination and reelection were then pending. Still the majority of his constituents held up his hands; and it was not long until criticism ceased. All men bore testimony to his foresight, and thanked him for the very courage with which he had opposed their wishes.

The history of Mr. Garfield's most valuable service in the Thirty-eighth Congress has now been given at some length. His other labors can be briefly dismissed.

His first considerable speech was delivered January 28, 1864, on the seizure and confiscation of the property of rebels. In this speech, called by Henry Winter Davis "the speech of the session," he discussed with ability the law-points involved, and poured upon the subject a flood of light derived from the political and juridical history of the country. The speech is found in "The Globe," January 28, 1864.

It will be remembered that the progress of the war was much embarrassed by complications with certain railroads; notably the road from New York to Philadelphia furnished inadequate facilities for transportation between those cities. The executive departments, as well as the traveling public, made sore complaints. The difficulty was aggravated by the narrow policy long adhered to by the State of New Jersey. These facts hastened the arrival in national politics of a great question—the relation of the General Government to the interstate railroads. March 24 and 31, 1864, the House having under consideration the bill to declare the Raritan and Atlantic Railroad a legal structure for commerce between New York and Philadelphia, Mr. Garfield delivered an able speech entitled "Free Commerce between the States." It was the first of his speeches to appear in pamphlet.

January 18, 1865, in reply to Hon. G. H. Pendleton, of his own State, he made a

strong speech on the Constitutional Amendment to abolish slavery. Considerable extracts from this speech will appear under the proper head. February 17, 1864, there came up in the House a resolution to thank Major-General Thomas and the officers and men who fought under him in the great battle of Chickamauga. On an amendment of his own to insert the name of Major-General Rosecrans before the name of Thomas, he made a brilliant eulogy on his old commander of the Army of the Cumberland. It was in this Congress, too, that he delivered his famous invective on Mr. Long, a Representative from Ohio.

In the session of 1863-'64, charges against the management of the Treasury were afloat in the country. They were iterated and reiterated by the opposition newspapers. Naturally they found expression in the House of Representatives. One charge was, that Secretary Chase was using abandoned plantations in the South so as to obtain means for advancing his own political aims. Another was, that gross frauds were going on in the Printing Bureau of the Treasury. It will be remembered that the party in power had set up this Bureau. Several hundred women were employed in the work—the first instance of women in large numbers being admitted to the Government service. This will explain the third charge, which was that “much evil had been produced by the conversion of the Treasury building into a house of orgies and bacchanals.” The *animus* of these attacks on the Treasury was partly a desire to injure Secretary Chase; partly a disposition to embarrass the Government; but principally to advance the interests of the engraving and bank-note companies. These companies desired to break up the Printing Bureau, and to compel the Treasury to hire the companies to do the work at such prices as they might dictate. That they might be in a better position to negotiate with the Government, all the companies had formed a close monopoly, and had actually got control of many of the engravers and presses of the Old World. Accordingly, April 30, 1864, Mr. Garfield offered a resolution to the effect that a committee of nine be appointed by the Speaker to investigate all these charges, or any other

allegations which had been made, or might be made, affecting the integrity of the administration of the Treasury Department. His motion was carried. In obedience to the custom, he was himself made the chairman of the Committee, some of the ablest members of the House being associated with him. A most painstaking and exhaustive investigation, extending over two months, and reaching to every nook and cranny of the Treasury, was made. June 30, 1864, Mr. Garfield submitted the majority report. Its various findings and recommendations can not here be specified. It declared that the Bureau had resulted in a great saving of expense to the Government, that it was a great security against fraud, and that its affairs had been administered with marked ability and integrity. It was a most able and valuable document. It is well worth reading to-day for the information that it furnishes concerning the operations of the Treasury, and especially the Printing Bureau.

Mr. Garfield's name is prominently connected with other public measures in the Thirty-eighth Congress. These must be passed over. At its close he had won a most enviable position in the House, and before a large section of the public.

July 4, 1865, General Garfield delivered an oration at Ravenna, Ohio, in which he took strong ground in favor of negro suffrage. One of his most forcible arguments was that, unless the ballot was given the negroes, since they would henceforth be counted man for man in making up the basis of representation, and not five for three as under the old rule, a state of things very like the old English rotten borough system would exist in the South. This argument was fully illustrated by a history of the gross abuses swept away by the English Reform Bill of 1832. One striking sentence from this oration was long used as a motto by a local newspaper: “Suffrage and Safety, like Liberty and Union, are one and inseparable.”

II.

Thirty-ninth Congress, 1865-'67.

At the opening of the Thirty-ninth Congress, the Speaker asked Mr. Garfield his preference as to the committee to which he should be assigned. He said he did not wish

to go upon the Military Committee again, and that his preference was the Ways and Means. He was accordingly assigned to that committee, the chairman of which was Hon. J. S. Morrill. To some men this may seem a strange request. The Military Committee still had important duties to perform. The war was indeed over, but the army was to be reorganized. He was thoroughly familiar with the subjects which would come before that committee, and considerations of ease would suggest that he remain where he had been. But he consulted rather his usefulness to the country and the increase of his own knowledge and experience. He saw clearly that a new era was opening in national politics, and he wished to enter it with the first. What this era was in its great features must be stated, since such statement furnishes the proper introduction to the further history of Mr. Garfield's services.

An enormous debt had been contracted by the war; the credit of the Government in the money markets of the world was low; more than \$150,000,000 interest, at high rates, had to be provided for every year; a vast floating debt had either to be paid or funded; the army had to be paid off, and obligations on the score of bounties and pensions met; the two systems of taxation, external and internal, which had been created since the war began, although they yielded vast revenues, bore heavily upon the industries of the country, and needed to be thoroughly overhauled and better adjusted to the productive and tax-paying powers of the people. These were the fiscal questions of the new era. Then the close of the war found Southern society in ruins; the State governments were now to be set up under the general oversight of the national authority; and the white and black races, in their new conditions, as far as possible were to be adjusted to each other. These were reconstruction questions, and, unfortunately, lay almost wholly in the field of party politics. The questions staring Congress and the country in the face in 1865 were less startling and heroic than those of the war period; but they were more difficult, and, since the Nation exists for peace and not for war, more important. To build up, to restore, to bind together, and to heal what was crushed and

broken, especially in the presence of fierce passions, calls for a higher order of ability and nobler character than the simple work of destruction. We can now see why, in December, 1865, Mr. Garfield wished to be assigned to the Committee of Ways and Means. As will be fully brought out in the last chapter of this life, he at once entered upon those financial studies that have made him one of the greatest living authorities on American finance. These studies soon began to bear fruit in the House, though the richer harvest came in succeeding Congresses. His labors in the line of his committee work will first be described.

March 16, 1866, he made in the House an elaborate speech on "The Public Debt and Specie Payments." This was the first of his great efforts to maintain the public faith, and to turn the prow of the ship toward the shore of solid values. He attempted little beyond making a plain statement of the great financial problem before the country for solution. The bill under consideration related to the two leading points in that problem: 1. "To our indebtedness that shall accrue from time to time in course of the next three years"; 2. "To our currency and its relation to the standard of value." The bill in effect gave the Secretary of the Treasury power to exchange any description of bonds authorized by the act of March 3, 1865, entitled "An Act to Provide Ways and Means to support the Government," for Treasury notes or other obligations issued under any act of Congress, whether bearing interest or not; also power to sell such bonds, either in the United States or elsewhere, subject, as to amount, rate, and time, to the Secretary's own discretion, the proceeds of such sales to be used for retiring Treasury notes or other obligations issued under any act of Congress. It will be seen that the bill looked to meeting the obligations of the Nation, but especially to a contraction of the currency. It gave the Secretary full power to retire greenbacks at his discretion; and it was well known that Secretary McCulloch would use it to that end. Mr. Garfield's speech was an able one, showing a mastery of the whole subject. He clearly saw that sooner or later the country must return to specie payments; and this

he knew could be reached only by contracting the currency. One of the most valuable and impressive parts of the speech was his statement of the steps by which England resumed specie payments after the wars with Napoleon. The bill was lost. Still, out of the discussion came a law that gave the Secretary power to meet the public obligations, as well as power to contract the currency at the rate of four million dollars a month. This law, to the enactment of which Mr. Garfield powerfully contributed, was the first of the long series of steps that led to resumption of specie payments, January 1, 1879. Said he, in closing: "Mr. Speaker, I remember that on the monument of Queen Elizabeth, where her glories were recited and her honors summed up, among the last and the highest, recorded as the climax of her honors, was this: that she had restored the money of her kingdom to its just value. And when this House shall have done its work, when it shall have brought back values to the proper standard, it will deserve a monument."

One of the most important questions that came before the Thirty-ninth Congress was the revision of the Tariff law of 1861. Space can not be taken to define that law, and the various amendments made to it from time to time; nor can the history of the legislation of 1866 be followed. Mr. Garfield took a prominent part in the discussion. His principal speech, the first of his considerable speeches on the Tariff, was made July 10th. It contains the great doctrines that have guided its author in all his utterances on this subject. This is its key-note:

I hold that a properly adjusted competition between home and foreign products is the best gauge by which to regulate international trade *Duties should be so high that our manufacturers can fairly compete with the foreign product*, but not so high as to enable them to drive out the foreign article, enjoy a monopoly of the trade, and regulate the price as they please. This is my doctrine of Protection. If Congress pursues this line steadily, we shall year by year approach more nearly to the basis of Free Trade, because we shall be more nearly able to compete with other nations on equal terms. I am for Protection that leads to ultimate Free Trade. I am for that Free Trade which can only be achieved through a reasonable protection.

Mr. Garfield's comprehensive mind and liberal spirit recoiled from a state of permanent protection. Still he believed that protection *for the time* was essential to ultimate freedom of trade. Such is his position to-day. Here it may be said that American commerce in 1866 was a house of a thousand gables. The Tariff law of 1861 attempted to furnish each roof, no matter how small, with trough and spouting to carry even the dribblets of revenue to the great national reservoir at Washington. The system was picturesque and striking, but inconvenient and costly. Mr. Garfield has always favored the removal of much of this complicated machinery. He has held that the system can be greatly simplified, and that the importer and traveler can be relieved of much vexation and expense without endangering domestic industry or the national revenues. His full views on the Tariff will be presented in his own words in another place.

In February, 1866, the National Association of School Superintendents held its annual meeting in Washington City. One of its labors was to draft a memorial, praying Congress to establish a National Bureau or Department of Education. As Mr. Garfield had once been an educator, and was still known as an ardent friend of education, the management of the memorial was intrusted to him. The House referred it to a select committee, of which he was chairman. This committee reported a "Bill to establish a National Bureau of Education." June 8, 1866, he made an able speech in support of this bill. At first the measure was lost by a decided majority. Subsequently it was reconsidered and passed. The concurrence of the Senate and the President's approval made the bill a law. It was almost wholly owing to him that this important measure was carried. He gave it not only his earnest support in the committee and on the floor, but made an energetic private canvass among the members. Since its creation, he has defended the Bureau against all assaults; and if some of its original powers have since been sheared away, and its efficiency thereby much impaired, it has not been without his earnest protest.

It is proper here to depart from strict

chronological order to give an account of General Garfield's later labors in the cause of National Education. He made a short, though forcible speech on "National Aid to Education," February 6, 1872. Again, February 11, 1879, he discussed elaborately, in a most enlightened and liberal spirit, the "Relation of the National Government to Science." Before the subject is here dismissed, it should be said, these speeches show their author to be one of the ablest and most zealous friends of education in the country, fully deserving the eulogy of Senator Hoar: "He was one of the earliest and foremost advocates of building up the educational interests of the South, at the national charge." Before this Congress also came the troublesome reconstruction questions growing out of the war. From the first, Mr. Garfield bore an important part in the debates on this subject. February 1, 1866, the House having under consideration the "Bill to enlarge the Powers of the Freedmen's Bureau," he made a carefully prepared speech on the "Restoration of the Rebel States." "Remarks" made February 8 and 12, 1867, on the "Bill to Place the Rebel States under Military Control," will be found in "The Globe" for the session.

The first angry notes of the conflict with President Johnson, that culminated in the impeachment of 1868, were heard early in the Thirty-ninth Congress. They became more and more angry as time wore on. On all questions at issue between the legislative and the executive authority, Mr. Garfield stood resolutely with his party.

Nor must it be forgotten that the reorganization of the army was going on. His transferral from the Military Committee to the Ways and Means subtracted nothing from his interest in the army. His great familiarity with army matters, as well as his general qualities as a legislator, were of substantial value, both to Congress and to the country, on this subject.

Before closing the sketch of his services in this Congress, two of his outside labors may be referred to. March 6, 1866, he made the argument on the Milligan and Bowles case, in the Supreme Court, that will be referred to at length in Chapter

VII. He had also been retained as counsel to defend the will of Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, West Virginia, then recently deceased. A quarter of a million dollars was involved. Expecting the case to come to trial at an early day, he made a thorough study of the law of wills. In the spring of 1868 he tried the case before referees, in Wellsburg, West Virginia. He managed it with great ability, and the referees, finding that Mr. Campbell was of "sound disposing mind and memory" when the will was made, decided that it was valid.

The close of the session, March 4, 1867, found Mr. Garfield's health very much impaired by his onerous duties in the House, by other public and professional duties, and by assiduous private study. He therefore determined to gratify a long-cherished desire, and if possible to restore his health, by a trip to Europe. This trip, lasting four months, is one of the most pleasing and interesting episodes of his life. Its history must be left to the biographers. Suffice it to say, he made the most of it. According to his customary habit whenever he has anything important to do, he laid out a regular plan of travel, and pursued his observations and other studies in methodical order. He came home just before the first session of the Fortieth Congress, his mind full of new facts, ideas, and impressions, and his health fully recovered. If some reader is wearied by this long recital of political facts, perhaps he can refresh his mind with this report of a sermon delivered in Chester Cathedral by Dr. Neale of Liverpool, Honorary Canon of the Cathedral, and reported by General Garfield in a private letter to the author of this Text-Book, dated London, August 2, 1867:

The text was from Luke: "This do in remembrance of me." He commenced by saying that the meaning of the Lord's Supper, as discussed by Luther and the Church of Rome, was settled by the Church of England when it became a Protestant Church; protesting, among other things, against the literal interpretation which Rome put upon the "*hoc est corpus meum*" of the Saviour, and claiming it to be a novelty, an innovation, a falling away from the ancient faith. For three hundred years this question had been at rest in the Church of England; but for the last

few years there has been a current setting back toward Rome, till at last a bishop, the head of the ancient Diocese of Salisbury, has declared, in his solemn charge to his subordinates, that the Lord's Supper is the real presence, that the wine is a bloody sacrifice, and that all His officiating ministers are sacrificial priests

He would confront the Bishop of Salisbury with the declaration of his noble predecessor, Bishop Jewell, who discussed this very question three hundred years ago, and told the priests of Rome that, if they would prove that the body of Christ was in a thousand places at the same time, he would turn Papist. The present Bishop ought not to turn till he can give as strong proof.

He then considered the Lord's Supper as meaning four things

1. *Remembrance of an absent friend* If He is here, why eat in remembrance of Him? His absence is implied in the text. In another place we are told where His body now is—at the right hand of God, and He will remain there till all his foes are subdued. The real presence is found in the "Lo! I am with you always." The believer meets the real presence in prayer, not in remembrance.

2. *An open "profession of faith."* "As often as you do this, you do show forth His death." To the early Christian this was a test which involved torture, and perhaps death.

3. *A pledge and vow of faithful service* For this reason it came to be called a sacrament. This is not a Biblical term; it is borrowed from pagan Rome. When the Roman became a soldier, he took what was called a *sacramentum*, or oath, to be true to the imperial banner. It is proper to use this pagan custom to illustrate the vow which a Christian takes, in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, to be faithful to the Captain of his salvation; but we have no right to import a heathen word into our theology, and then base theological doctrines on secondary meanings of that word. It is incumbent on the ritualists to show how the word *sacramentum* came to mean an outward sign of an inward spiritual operation. By this abuse of the word they have come to use such jargon as this: "A thing may be sacramentally but not literally true."

4. *A personally appropriating enjoyment of Christ himself* to one who rises to the full height of this great theme—the grace, power, and merit of the incarnation in the communion. But the Lord's Supper transforms neither the bread nor the eater. Whatever he is to it, it is to him. To some, the Supper is only a remembrance; to others, it is both remembrance and communion

It should be remembrance of, profession of, pledge to, and communion with Christ himself

In conclusion, Dr. Neale called upon all Christians to rally to the defense of their ancient faith, and, finally, called upon all Englishmen, if they did not care for their religion, to rally against the new heresy if they would save their civil liberties. Protestantism had saved England from the fate of Spain hitherto, if we would not now fall as Spain fell, we must demand of the House of Lords, who were now considering this great question, to maintain the ancient faith of Protestant England.

III.

Fortieth Congress, 1867-'69.

How greatly Mr. Garfield's prominence in the House of Representatives had grown since he entered it four years before, is shown by the indexes of "The Globe" for the sessions of '63-'64 and '67 '68. In the first, the references to him fill half a column; in the second, three full columns. However, this greater number of references is partly explained by the mass of minute details with which his committee was overwhelmed. Manifestly, it is impossible even to glance at the great majority of these references. All that can or need be done is, first, to say that he was active on all questions of prime importance; and, second, to follow four or five of the principal lines of his activity.

The zeal for specie resumption that was so general at the close of the war had now, in great degree, subsided. The original "Ohio idea," which was to pay the bonds in greenbacks, had not only been promulgated by Mr. Pendleton, but it had been received with marked favor as well in other States as in Ohio. Even the Ohio Republican platform of 1867 showed a decided leaning toward the new heresy. After his return from Europe, but before the beginning of the session, Mr. Garfield was invited to make a political speech in Jefferson, Ohio. So strong were the tides running against resumption, that some of his friends, who were also resumptionists, cautioned him not to touch the finances in the existing state of public feeling. Disregarding their counsel, he stated his convictions as strongly as ever, declaring that before the nomination for Representative in the District should occur, he wished it to be fully understood what his position was.

Inflation was now rampant. The country was getting crazier in speculation every day, and the soil was being prepared for that rank crop of economical and financial schemes that sprung up with such luxuriance a few years later. In the House, as on the platform, Mr. Garfield stood fast to the resumption colors. His strenuous opposition to the popular tendencies, together with the necessity of wholly reorganizing the committees, probably explain why, in opposition to his wishes, he was not again put on the Committee of Ways and Means, but was made chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. Disappointed as he was at the turn affairs had taken, he was not the man to neglect his public duties because they were not all to his liking.

Three years had now passed since the close of the war. Reconstruction was in rapid process of accomplishment. The army was no longer needed in as large force as before in the South; the semi-military period was soon to give way to the civil period; and the army could be considerably reduced. Besides, it stood in need of pretty thorough reorganization. A vast avalanche of details was precipitated on the Committee, questions of bounties, of rank, of the staff, of the line, of pay, of claims, of rules and discipline, and of what not, had to be handled. Such matters gave small scope for that sort of activity which attracts general attention or impresses men's imaginations; but they gave unlimited opportunity for hard work and for wisdom. As Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Garfield conducted a searching investigation into all the affairs of the army. Many of the most able, most experienced, and most prominent officers in the service were called to give expert testimony concerning the various subjects investigated. This testimony was submitted to the House, accompanied by an analysis and summing up from the pen of the Chairman. The intelligence that Mr. Garfield brought to the consideration of army affairs, and his appreciation of the character and services of educated soldiers, as well as his own record as an able officer of volunteers, commended him to the confidence of what may be called army circles. From that day the officers of all grades, especially the abler and better edu-

cated, have felt that the interests of the army would not be sacrificed to popular clamor or to demagoguery without his strenuous opposition.

January 17, 1868, he contributed to the long reconstruction debate a speech entitled, "Reconstruction and the Constitutional Power of Congress to Control the Army" ("Globe" for the session '67-'68). Read at this distance, the most vigorous paragraph in this speech is the following, which is all the more interesting reading now, because the Major-General denounced is the opposition candidate for the Presidency:

Mr. Speaker, I will not repeat the long catalogue of obstructions which he [the President] has thrown in the way by virtue of the power conferred upon him in the Reconstruction law of 1867; but I will allude to one example where he has found in a major-general of the army a facile instrument with which more effectually to obstruct the work of reconstruction. This case is all the more painful because an otherwise meritorious officer, who bears honorable scars earned in battle for the Union, has been made a party to the political madness which has so long marked the conduct of the President. This General was sent into the district of Louisiana and Texas with a law of Congress in his hand, a law that commands him to see that justice is administered among the people of that country, and that no pretense of civil authority shall deter him from performing his duty; and yet we find that officer giving lectures in the form of proclamations and orders on what ought to be the relation between the civil and military departments of the Government. We see him issuing a general order in which he declares that the civil should not give way before the military. We hear him declaring that he finds nothing in the laws of Louisiana and Texas to warrant his interference in the civil administration of those States. It is not for him to say which should be first, the civil or the military, in that rebel community. It is not for him to search the defunct laws of Louisiana and Texas for a guide to his conduct. It is for him to obey the laws which he was sent there to execute. It is for him to aid in building up civil governments, *rather than preparing himself to be the Presidential candidate of the party* which gave him no sympathy when he was gallantly fighting the battles of the country.

February 29, 1868, the House being in Committee of the Whole on the Articles of Impeachment, Mr. Garfield made a speech,

not upon the articles as such, but on the question of impeachment. He had been absent in West Virginia when the House resolved to impeach President Johnson. He now explained that his absence had prevented his voting for impeachment. (See "Globe," March 2, 1868.) Here it should be stated that, in its earlier stages, he had resisted the impeachment movement on grounds of expediency; but now the usurpation of power in removing Secretary Stanton from the War Office convinced him that Mr. Johnson was dangerous to the country's peace, and that impeachment was his proper punishment.

He opposed the measure to suspend the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to contract the currency at the rate of four million dollars a month. More than this, he offered the following resolution.

Resolved, That the bill forbidding the further contraction of the currency be recommitted to the Committee of Ways and Means, and that they be instructed to report to the House such legislative measures as shall most speedily and safely lead to resumption of specie payments.

On the 15th of May, 1868, he made an elaborate speech on "The Currency," that stands with the first of his great intellectual efforts. After pointing out the new turn that public questions were taking, he discussed in order the following topics: "The Hard Times," "From Peace to War," "From War to Peace," "The Functions of Currency," "Relation of Currency to Prices," "Increase of the Currency is Taxation," "Its Chief Burden falls on the Laborer," "Depreciated Currency stimulates Speculation and Overtrading," "How much Currency is Needed?" "Relation of Currency to Financial Panics," "Does the High Rate of Interest indicate an Insufficient Amount of Currency?" "Scarcity of Currency in the West," "Inconvertible Paper Money has no Fixed Value," "Paper-Money Delusions," "Real Cause of the Reaction," "Our Past Experience," "Colonial Paper," "Continental Currency," "Paper Money of the Revolution," "Provisions of the Constitution in Reference to Paper Money," "Necessity of a Settled Policy," "What has the Fortieth Congress Done in Reference to this Subject?" "The Contraction Policy,"

"Plan for Restoring the Standard of Values," "English Precedents." It is hardly too much to say that this great speech is at once a sound-money manual and a cyclopædia—a manual of doctrine and a cyclopædia of facts. Thinking that if it could be seen in Europe it would strengthen the public credit, the Secretary of the Treasury sent some copies abroad. One of these fell into the hands of John Bright. On Mr. Bright's motion, Garfield was elected an honorary member of the Cobden Club. It has been the fashion, in certain quarters, to assert that this election meant that General Garfield is a Free Trader; than which nothing could be more silly, as it was intended only to recognize his great ability and services on financial subjects. Extended quotations will be made from this speech in another place. It can be found in full in "The Globe," May 15, 1868. The speech closed with this firm declaration:

For my own part, my course is taken. In view of all the facts of our situation, of all the terrible experiences of the past, both at home and abroad, and of the united testimony of the wisest and bravest statesmen who have lived and labored during the last century, it is my firm conviction that any considerable increase of the volume of our inconvertible paper money will shatter public credit, will paralyze industry, and oppress the poor; and that the gradual restoration of our ancient standard of value will lead us, by the safest and surest paths, to national prosperity and the steady pursuits of peace.

July 15, 1868, Mr. Garfield made a speech in reply to Hons. F. A. Pike and B. F. Butler, on "Taxation of United States Bonds." (See appendix to "Globe," July 15, 1868.) His fundamental propositions were: 1. "That the law creating the bonds specially declares them exempt from all State and municipal taxation." 2. "Even if the law were silent on this subject, the Constitution of the United States interferes to prevent it." "In a long line of judicial decisions, extending over nearly half a century," he said, "it has been again and again declared by the Supreme Court that such taxation is forbidden by the Constitution." Again the English precedents came within the range of his discussion. Mr. Garfield now began to feel a measure of popular support, that earlier in the session he had not felt. General Grant had

been nominated at Chicago, on a thorough-going anti-repudiation platform, and even the National Democratic Convention had refused to nominate the originator of the "Ohio idea," Mr. G. H. Pendleton. He had never distrusted the people if they could be made to understand the issue. His growing confidence in the public intelligence and honesty finds a voice in the close of this speech, thus:

Mr. Speaker, I desire to say, in conclusion, that in my opinion all these efforts to pursue a doubtful and unusual, if not dishonorable policy in reference to our public debt, spring from a lack of faith in the intelligence and conscience of the American people. Hardly an hour passes when we do not hear it whispered that some such policy as this must be adopted, or the people will by and by repudiate the debt. For my own part, I do not share that distrust. The people of this country have shown, by the highest proofs human nature can give, that wherever the path of duty and honor may lead, however steep and rugged it may be, they are ready to walk in it. They feel the burden of the public debt, but they remember that it is the price of blood—the precious blood of half a million brave men who died to save to us all that makes life desirable or property secure. I believe they will, after a full hearing, discard all methods of paying their debts by sleight-of-hand, or by any scheme which crooked wisdom may devise. If public morality did not protest against any such plan, enlightened public selfishness would refuse its sanction. Let us be true to our trust a few years longer, and the next generation will be here with its seventy-five millions of population and its sixty billions of wealth. To them the debt that then remains will be a light burden. They will pay the last bond according to the letter and spirit of the contract, with the same sense of grateful duty with which they will pay the pensions of the few surviving soldiers of the great war for the Union.

A curious piece of financial history is found in "The Globe" for July 23, 1868 (pp. 4970-72). Mr. Garfield asked permission to make a personal explanation of fifteen minutes. Permission being granted, he sent to the desk, for the clerk to read, some remarks made by Mr. Stevens of Pennsylvania a few days before. The pith of these remarks was, that it was the original intention to pay the bonds, not "in coin" but "in money"; that, rather than go with the Re-

publicans if they held to coin payments, Mr. Stevens would vote for the other side, Frank Blair and all; and that the coin payment was a "swindle upon the tax-payers of the country." Mr. Garfield went on to say that, at the time of Mr. Stevens making these remarks, he had expressed his surprise, and had referred to the fact that in 1862, in the debate on the bill authorizing the Fifty-two bonds, Mr. Stevens himself had distinctly declared that these bonds were payable in gold, and that such was the unanimous opinion and intention of Congress at the time. Mr. Garfield next quoted some remarks made by Mr. Stevens, July 22d, in which that gentleman denounced General Garfield and others as having wholly perverted his meaning in 1862, and reaffirmed that he had always contended for the payment of the bonds "in money," that is, in greenbacks. Mr. Stevens charged "villainy" upon these perverters of his meaning, and warned the people against putting faith in the publications of demagogues! Mr. Garfield then went on to show by full citations from "The Globe," not only that the original intention of Congress was to pay the bonds in coin, but that Mr. Stevens had stated five distinct times that the principal of the bonds was payable in gold. At the close of this explanation, Mr. Stevens said when the proper time came he would show there was not a word of truth in what Mr. Garfield said. The proper time never came. General Garfield's statement is unanswered to this day. No answer could be made. It is hard to account for Mr. Stevens's inconsistency on the question of paying the obligations of the Government. His latter-day infatuation for paper money seems to have carried away his memory, and even his ability to read "The Globe" correctly.

May 30, 1868, General Garfield delivered a most felicitous oration at Arlington, Virginia, on the occasion of strewing flowers on the graves of Union soldiers. The peroration of this oration will enliven what, I fear, is becoming a dry, matter-of-fact narrative:

What other spot so fitting for their last resting-place as this, under the shadow of the Capitol saved by their valor? Here, where the grim edge of battle joined; here, where all the

hope and fear and agony of their country centered; here let them rest, asleep on the nation's heart, entombed in the nation's love!

The view from this spot bears some resemblance to that which greets the eye at Rome. In sight of the Capitoline Hill, up and across the Tiber, and overlooking the city, is a hill, not rugged nor lofty, but known as the Vatican Mount. At the beginning of the Christian era, an imperial circus stood on its summit. There gladiator slaves died for the sport of Rome, and wild beasts fought with wilder men. In that arena a Galilean fisherman gave up his life, a sacrifice for his faith. No human life was ever so nobly avenged. On that spot was reared the proudest Christian temple ever built by human hands. For its adornment the rich offerings of every clime and kingdom have been contributed. And now, after eighteen centuries, the hearts of two hundred million people turn toward it with reverence when they worship God. As the traveler descends the Apennines, he sees the dome of St. Peter's rising above the desolate Campagna and the dead city, long before the seven hills and ruined palaces appear to his view. The fame of the dead fisherman has outlived the glory of the Eternal City. A noble life, crowned with heroic death, rises above and outlives the pride and pomp and glory of the mightiest empire of the earth.

Seen from the western slope of our Capitol, in direction, distance, and appearance, this spot is not unlike the Vatican Mount, though the river that flows at our feet is larger than a hundred Tibers. Seven years ago, this was the home of one who lifted his sword against the life of his country, and who became the great Emperor of the rebellion. The soil beneath our feet was watered by the tears of slaves, in whose hearts the sight of yonder proud Capitol awakened no pride, and inspired no hope. The face of the goddess that crowns it was turned toward the sea, and not toward them. But, thanks be to God, this arena of rebellion and slavery is a scene of violence and crime no longer! This will be for ever the sacred mountain of our Capitol. Here is our temple; its pavement is the sepulchre of heroic hearts; its dome, the bending heaven; its altar candles, the watching stars.

Hither our children's children shall come to pay their tribute of grateful homage. For this are we met to-day. By the happy suggestion of a great society, assemblies like this are gathering at this hour in every State in the Union. Thousands of soldiers are to-day turning aside in the

march of life to visit the silent encampments of dead comrades who once fought by their side.

From many thousand homes, whose light was put out when a soldier fell, there go forth to-day, to join these solemn processions, loving kindred and friends, from whose hearts the shadow of grief will never be lifted until the light of the eternal world dawns upon them.

And here are children, little children, to whom the war left no father but the Father above. By the most sacred right, theirs is the chief place to-day. They come with garlands to crown their victor fathers. I will delay the coronation no longer.

IV.

Forty-first Congress, 1869-'71.

The stream of Mr. Garfield's activity in the House is widening out into a vast sea. Little more can be done in this life than to follow the main currents. This will be seen when it is stated that his set speeches in the Forty-first Congress would make a volume, not to mention the innumerable short speeches and remarks made in running debate. Happily for the historian, his committee work again lies in the stream of his principal activity. He is Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. But before taking up the financial questions, attention must be paid to a most interesting subject lying outside the great current. I mean his attempt to give the United States an improved Census in 1870.

January 19, 1869, Mr. Garfield introduced a resolution, "That a select committee of seven be appointed to inquire and report to the House what legislation is necessary to provide for taking the ninth census, as provided by the Constitution," said committee to report at any time by bill or otherwise. The resolution was adopted, and its author was made chairman of the Committee. However, it was found impossible, at the close of the Fortieth Congress, to give the subject the attention that it deserved. At the first session of the Forty-first Congress, held in the spring of 1869, another Select Census Committee was ordered. Political and personal considerations gave the chairmanship to Mr. Stokes of Tennessee, but with the understanding that Mr. Garfield was to do the work. His economical and financial studies had long be-

fore led him to a careful study of statistics. So far was he from being content merely to use statistics, that he studied them as a science, and was so led to study the Census, which, in the United States, is the great instrument by which statistics are gathered. He had been deeply impressed by the imperfection of the Census Reports, and was not long in discovering that the main cause of the imperfection lay in the law itself. It was this conviction that caused him to introduce the resolution of January 19, 1869. He now entered upon a vigorous study of the subject in all its branches. He exhausted the American literature of statistics and censuses; then he turned to the lessons that Europe could teach him—England, France, and Belgium. The larger share of the time that he could save from imperative duties, for a full year, were devoted to this study. April 6, 1869, he made an admirable speech (see "Globe" of that date), in which he discussed the value of statistics to the legislator, touched upon the history of the science, pointed out some of the defects of the old law of 1840, and suggested some of the remedies. Two of his paragraphs may be fitly quoted in this place:

This is the age of statistics, Mr Speaker. The word "statistics" itself did not exist until 1749, whence we date the beginning of a new science on which modern legislation must be based, in order to be permanent. The treatise of Achenwall, the German philosopher who originated the word, laid the foundation of many of the greatest reforms in modern legislation. Statistics are State facts, facts for the consideration of statesmen, such as they may not neglect with safety. It has been truly said that "statistics are history in repose; history is statistics in motion." If we neglect the one, we shall deserve to be neglected by the other. The legislator without statistics is like the mariner at sea without the compass. Nothing can safely be committed to his guidance. A question of fearful importance, the well-being of this Republic, has agitated this House for many weeks. It is this: Are our rich men growing richer, and our poor growing poorer? And how can this most vital question be settled, except by the most careful and honest examination of the facts? Who can doubt that the next census will reveal to us more important truths concerning the situation of our people than any census ever taken by any nation? By what stand-

ard could we measure the value of a complete, perfect record of the condition of the people of this country, and such facts as should exhibit their burdens and their strength? Who doubts that it would be a document of inestimable value to the legislator and the Nation? How to achieve it, how to accomplish it, is the great question.

We are near the end of a decade that has been full of earthquakes, and amid the tumult we have lost our reckoning. We do not yet comprehend the stupendous changes through which we have passed, nor can we until the whole field is resurveyed. If a thousand volcanoes had been bursting beneath the ocean, the mariner would need new charts before he could safely sail the seas again. We are soon to set out on our next decade with a thousand new elements thrown in upon us by the war. The way is trackless. Who shall pilot us? The war repealed a part of our venerable census law. One schedule was devoted to slaves. Thank God! it is useless now. Old things have passed away, and a multitude of new things are to be here recorded; and not only the things to be taken, but the manner of taking them, requires a thorough remodeling at our hands. If this Congress does not worthily meet the demands of this great occasion, every member must bear no small share of the odium that justly attaches to men who fail to discharge duties of momentous importance, which once neglected can never be performed.

By the opening of Congress in December, 1869, the Select Committee had sat forty days, hearing the testimony of experts, discussing the Census in all its bearings, and maturing a Census bill. When this bill was introduced the House gave it prompt and thorough attention. Mr. Garfield made an elaborate speech, December 16th, in which he went over all the main points. The bill passed the House, but, unfortunately, was lost in the Senate, owing more to the personal antagonisms of Senators than to any other cause. The loss of the bill was very greatly regretted by the most enlightened politicians and citizens, and by none more keenly than by students of social science. So the Ninth Census had to be taken under the old law, with some slight modifications. While the Census of 1870 is superior to all preceding ones, mainly owing to a better superintendence, it is far from being what the Garfield bill would have given us. Still, these labors were not wholly lost to the country. Mr. Garfield

introduced the old measure, with such modifications as fuller experience suggested, into the Forty-sixth Congress. It was referred to the Select Committee on Census, of which Hon. S. S. Cox was chairman. This gentleman reported from the committee a new bill, the same in all its main features as the Garfield bill, and this became the law under which the Census of 1880 is now being taken.

In the mean time the currency conflict was going on with increased violence. The Presidential campaign of 1868 gave financial heresies no permanent check. But in the midst of the storm a step forward was taken, the history of which must be here given both on account of its importance and on account of Mr. Garfield's instrumentality in bringing it about.

December 14, 1868, he introduced into the House a bill to legalize gold contracts. This bill became part of a more comprehensive measure, viz., Mr. Schenck's bill of January 20, 1869, "To Strengthen the public Credit, and Relating to Gold Contracts." This bill, variously amended, passed both Houses at the close of the session; but the President gave it a pocket veto. March 12, 1869, at the first session of the Forty-first Congress, it was reintroduced into the House. It promptly passed both branches of Congress, and was the first Act approved by President Grant. It may be fitly transcribed here.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That, in order to remove any doubt as to the purpose of the Government to discharge all just obligations to the public creditors, and to settle conflicting questions and interpretations of the laws by virtue of which such obligations have been contracted, it is hereby provided and declared that the faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment in coin or its equivalent of all the obligations of the United States not bearing interest, known as United States notes, and of all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of any such obligation has expressly provided that the same may be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver. But none of said interest-bearing obligations not already due shall be redeemed or paid before maturity, unless at

such time United States notes shall be convertible into coin at the option of the holder, or unless at such time bonds of the United States bearing a lower rate of interest than the bonds to be redeemed can be sold at par in coin. And the United States also solemnly pledges its faith to make provision at the earliest practicable period for the redemption of the United States notes in coin.

Approved March 18, 1869.

This law may be called the great legal bulwark of the public credit from 1869 to 1879. Attempts were made to repeal it, but in vain. It was a plain declaration that the obligations of the Government were to be paid in coin; and henceforth there could be no question that the nation was pledged to coin payments. Paper-money men denounced the act and its authors savagely; some declared that, if carried out, it would cost the country a thousand million dollars. It was said to be a gigantic swindle. But as it gave a new point of departure for financial operations, as well as legislation, men came to acquiesce in it as a thing accomplished; and, in the subsequent financial storms that swept the country, thousands of men, who had been in doubt whether the original acts authorizing the bonds and greenbacks required coin redemption, anchored securely to the great statute "to strengthen the public credit." Mr. Garfield's short though vigorous speech on the bill will be found in the appropriate place, delivered March 3, 1869. (See "Globe" of that date.)

A second important step toward resumption and sound money was taken by the Forty-first Congress, and under Mr. Garfield's lead. The cry was coming up from all quarters that the currency was insufficient to meet the wants of business. It was particularly loud from the Southern and Western States. Led partly by a sense of justice and partly by political prescience, he drew up, and introduced from his Committee, "A Bill to increase Banking Facilities, and for other Purposes." The national banks were preponderatingly in the older States. Not seeing that this was mainly owing to the fact that these States owned the most of the banking capital of the country, Western and Southern men denounced the geographical distri-

bution of banks as unjust, and as working to their disadvantage. As no more banks could be organized under the law of 1864, which limited the total capital to \$300,000,000, they clamored for unrestricted banking. Mr. Garfield saw that, if the Western States actually had more capital to embark in banking, the existing distribution was unfair; and he also saw that if, as he believed, they had no such capital, the opening to them of the opportunity would reduce the cry for more banks to a practical absurdity. His bill as finally passed is called "An Act to provide for the Redemption of the Three per cent. Temporary Loan Certificates, and for an Increase of National Bank Notes." It provided that \$54,000,000 in national notes might be issued to banking associations, in addition to the \$300,000,000 already authorized, the same to be given to banks organized, or to be organized, in those States and Territories having less than their proportion under the existing apportionment. The Secretary of the Treasury, at the close of each month, was to redeem and cancel an amount of the three per cent. certificates, not less than the total of notes so issued to the banks. It was also provided that the Secretary, under certain circumstances, should withdraw \$25,000,000 of circulation from certain of the existing banks, and apportion the same among the States and Territories having less than their fair proportion. These were the great features of the law; the minor ones may be omitted. Mr. Garfield made an able exposition of his scheme, in a speech delivered in the House, June 7, 1870, entitled "Currency and the Banks." He first presented his leading doctrines of money and currency, and then went on to present his redistributing scheme. The doctrinal part of this speech he has never surpassed; and, if space permitted, the whole of it would be reproduced in its appropriate place in this book. While the bill was pending, as he said, the critics on one side declared that it was a severe contraction measure; on the other, they as stoutly asserted that it would result in inflation. He denied both assertions, holding that it meant neither contraction nor inflation. In the end, it appeared that the complaining States had little or no capital to put into banks.

They did not come forward and claim the new facilities offered them. Practically, the matter stood where it had stood all along. Still the enactment of this law was a substantial benefit to the country. For years afterward, when the soft-money men called loudly for more money, the most telling reply to them was: "Why did not the South and West accept what was held out to them in the Act of July 12, 1870?" There was no answer; the law was a *reductio ad absurdum* of the inflation doctrine.

June 15, 1870, Mr. Garfield made a second speech in favor of his bill. In those days our currency was often eulogized because it was non-exportable; it would not go abroad, it was said, but staid at home! To some minds this was a very taking fallacy. Some one was so rash as to state it on the floor of the House. Mr. Garfield exposed the sophism in a bit of humor that should not be lost:

It is reported of an Englishman who was wrecked on a strange shore that, wandering along the coast, he came to a gallows with a victim hanging upon it, and that he fell down on his knees and thanked God that he at last beheld a sign of civilization. But this is the first time I ever heard a financial philosopher express his gratitude that we have a currency of such bad repute that other nations will not receive it; he is thankful that it is not exportable. We have a great many commodities that are in such a condition that they are not exportable. Moldy flour, rusty wheat, rancid butter, damaged cotton, addled eggs, and spoiled goods generally are not exportable. But it never occurred to me to be thankful for this putrescence. It is related in a quaint German book of humor that the inhabitants of Schildeberg, finding that other towns, with more public spirit than their own, had erected gibbets within their precincts, resolved that the town of Schildeberg should also have a gallows; and one patriotic member of the town council offered a resolution that the benefits of this gallows should be reserved exclusively for the inhabitants of Schildeberg!

But little more can be done than to catalogue the other speeches that Mr. Garfield made in this Congress. March 14, 1870, he made a speech on "Public Expenditures and Civil Service." That part of this speech relating to the second topic will be found in

another place. April 1st, the same year, he made an elaborate speech on the Tariff. February 20, 1871, he ably discussed the McGarrahan Claim. This was one of the many fraudulent claims to land in California, resting on pretended Mexican titles. His discussion began with an examination of the Mexican law of titles, and closely followed the "claim" through the United States Courts, and through its successive appearances in the Land Office and in Congress. It closed with declaring the claim the "greatest fraud ever recorded in the wildest romance of rascality." Toward the close of this Congress there came up a constitutional question, both curious and important. The Senate had originated a bill to reduce the income tax. The House resented this as an infringement of its rights to originate "all bills for raising revenue." Senators held that to reduce a tax was, in no sense, a measure for "raising revenue." Representatives insisted that this clause of the Constitution was intended to cover absolutely and exclusively the imposition, regulation, increase, diminution, or repeal of taxes. Not even a synopsis of Mr. Garfield's masterly argument, delivered March 3, 1871, can be given. He stoutly maintained the claims of the House. He followed the subject through the constitutional history of both England and the United States. So thorough and convincing is this speech, that it has come to be an authority on its subject in both houses of Congress.

December 13, 1869, the House instructed the Committee on Banking and Currency "to investigate the causes that led to the unusual and extraordinary fluctuations of gold in the city of New York from the 21st to the 27th of September, 1869." This resolution led to the "Gold Panic" Report of March 1st following. From the very nature of the case, this investigation was most difficult and most embarrassing: difficult from the very nature of the operations to be investigated; embarrassing because people in high station were said to be implicated. Reckless gold speculators, and equally reckless Democratic politicians, boldly charged that the President and his family were parties to the conspiracy. The good name of the Republic required that the President should be convicted or vindicated; while the

security of honest business demanded that the light of day should be let into the operations in gold which culminated in "Black Friday." As Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Garfield found his abilities taxed to the utmost in getting at the truth. Witnesses were examined both in New York and in Washington. At the end a very able report was presented, the findings of which can not be stated here further than to say that the White House was fully exonerated.

Leave is taken of the Forty-first Congress with saying, that in it General Garfield made as many great speeches as in any other in which he ever sat. His activity grew out of the number and character of important questions that came before Congress. I know of nothing that gives a stronger conviction of his great abilities than these speeches, especially when their dates are considered. At the second session of this Congress, between December 19th and June 15th following, only six months, he made the following speeches: "Ninth Census," "Public Expenditures and the Civil Service," "The Tariff," "Currency and the Banks," "Debate on the Currency Bill"; also the "Gold Panic" Report. Still the measure of his activity is not complete until we take into account the committee work and the short speeches, of which there are scores, that never found their way into pamphlet editions. The writer knows not where to find in the legislative history of our country anything that surpasses this exhibition of mental power.

V.

Forty-second and Forty-third Congresses— 1871-75.

General Garfield has never rendered the House of Representatives, or the public, more laborious and valuable services than as Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Other services may have been more brilliant and striking; none surpass these in patient labor or in substantial value. In 1871 this Committee, though not standing first on the list of committees, was really the most important in the House. Its duties were the most constant and the most exhausting. This is shown by the fact that, when General Garfield held the chairmanship, the Committee had the floor of the

House one third of the time. To prepare the twelve great bills, and to carry them in good form through the House, was a Herculean task. Their simple preparation took so much time that the work of the House was often delayed thereby. Chairman Garfield organized his Committee at the short session in the spring of 1871. He induced the members to hold a special meeting in the fall before the long session should begin. This was partly to save time, and partly to prepare the way for some valuable reforms that were already shaping themselves in his mind. His special work these four years can be considered under these heads: 1. His studies on the subject of appropriations; 2. His relation to the Committee and to the House; 3. The reforms that he brought about.

First, his studies.

Once more Mr. Garfield resorted to Europe for her lessons. He studied very carefully both the origin and the growth of the British and French budgets. He looked closely into the annual budgets of both countries in all their stages, and noted their relation to the work of government. He also carefully read the Budget speeches of the English Chancellors of the Exchequer for many years. Besides these more general studies, he went through the history of our own appropriations from 1789, finding that the method of appropriation had followed the well-known evolutionary law. At first all the appropriations made by Congress for a year were put into one bill, to be expended by the departments. Some principal points and items were fixed by law, but large discretionary powers were given to the heads of the departments, not only in reference to the number of subordinates but also in reference to items of expenditure. Next came the breaking up of the one bill into *bills*. The first proper Annual Appropriation bill, in the present sense, came in 1823. Others followed in 1826, '28, and '44. In 1847 the annual appropriations were made in nine separate bills. Others were added from time to time until 1862, when the differentiating process ceased: there were now twelve bills—Pensions, Legislative, Executive and Judicial, Consular and Diplomatic, Army, Navy, Military Academy, Post-Office, For-

tifications, Indian, Sundry Civil, Deficiency, and Rivers and Harbors. At this time the main features of our present method of appropriations had appeared. Much, however, then remained to be done in making the appropriations more special, and in taking from executive officers their great discretionary powers. The control of the public money by Congress needed to be more direct, minute, and rigid. Considerable progress in the right direction was made from 1862 to 1871, especially while Mr. Dawes of Massachusetts held the chairmanship of the Committee. But the method was still imperfect. In the first place, the appropriations needed to be more minutely analyzed in the bills. Then there were two kinds of appropriations—annual and permanent. The first are explained by their designation; the others were often indefinite in amount, as well as permanent in character. Frequently the law appropriated so much money to a given purpose as might be necessary. For years the Printing Bureau of the Treasury, sometimes employing twelve hundred men and women, and expending three million dollars, was supported from a permanent appropriation of one per cent. of all securities issued in the fiscal year. Mr. Garfield found that nearly one half of the expenses of the Government were provided for by these permanent appropriations, Congress exercising no direct control over them. Besides, unexpended balances of appropriations had been accumulating in the bureaus from the beginning of the Government. Thus, if one hundred thousand dollars was appropriated for a specific purpose, and any part of it remained unexpended at the end of the fiscal year, this balance stood on the books of the Treasury to the credit of the bureau, and could be used at any time for the purpose named. In 1872, when these balances were covered into the Treasury, they amounted to \$174,000,000. Mr. Dawes had led in a movement to cut off this dangerous abuse; but the work of reform was still far from complete when Mr. Garfield took the chairmanship of the Committee. There were also other abuses, the results of Congressional inaction or vicious action, that called loudly for reform. Still, an adequate idea of the work to be done has

not been given. Many appropriations, as the result of prodigal legislation in and following the war, were excessive. These needed to be reduced, not recklessly by cutting off this or that with a blow of the knife, but considerably, after comprehensive study of all the fiscal operations of the Government. What is more, that was the day of "claims," both great and small. Prodigal legislation, the spread of communistic ideas, the losses of the South in the war, had brought forth an enormous host of men bent on finding their way into the public Treasury. These were to be resisted. Now the reader is in a position to form an adequate idea of the work before the Committee, and especially before its Chairman, in 1871.

Second, Mr. Garfield's relations to the Committee and to the House.

At the meeting of the Committee in the fall of 1871, and subsequently as they matured, Chairman Garfield spread before his associates his ideas on the whole subject. He strove at the outset to call out the best energies of every man. The twelve great bills, as respected their preparation, introduction, and management in the House, were apportioned among the nine members, he taking the larger number. The member having a bill in charge was to manage it on the floor, and his fellow members were to rally to his support when support was needed. The work of the Committee was both defensive and offensive. As defensive, the men with claims and schemes were to be repelled. Still, as many just claims were presented, much winnowing and sifting was called for. As offensive, the Committee had to carry, often in the face of great opposition, their reform measures. Perhaps no committee ever worked together in the service of the country more effectively and harmoniously. When the appropriations were under consideration, the members of the Committee, and especially the Chairman, were on their feet a large share of the time. Still it was a service that did not give large opportunity for such speeches as "go to the country" and impress the popular imagination; but it consumed endless ability, energy, and patience in the study, in committee, and on the floor in running debate.

Here it may be said, the work had been so well done in the vacation of 1871 that six bills were introduced the first day of the session; and afterward they always came from the Committee with commendable promptitude.

Third, the reforms that were effected.

The classification of the purposes for which money was to be expended, and the specification of the amounts, were carried out much more minutely than ever before. Numerous and great discretionary powers of executive officers over the expenditures were withdrawn. With the exception of the interest on the public debt, which is necessarily provided for in the acts authorizing the loans, the expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, which come from the great trust confided by Mr. Smithson to Congress, and others of small importance, the permanent appropriations were wholly cut off. By successive steps, the unexpended balances were all covered into the Treasury; and it is now the law that any surplus of appropriations for any object remaining at the end of the fiscal year, unless it is needed to execute contracts already made, shall at once lapse to the Treasury. Withal, large reductions were made in the expenses of the Government. Of course this was largely due to the lengthening distance of the war. Many claims growing out of the war had been paid off. Interest had been considerably reduced by the reduction of the public debt, and by lowering rates of interest. Besides, a spirit of economy was returning both to Congress and to the country. But when proper allowance is made for all these things, great credit is still due to the Committee on Appropriations, and especially to Chairman Garfield, from 1871 to 1875, for the reduction of the national expenditures. It should be added that all these reforms were made in the face of strenuous opposition. Naturally they encountered the hostility of all lovers of large appropriations and all holders of claims. Executive officers, too, fond of having abundant funds at their disposal, resisted both the covering of the unexpended balances into the Treasury and the rigid provisions of law by which, at the close of each fiscal year, such balances go at once into the general fund.

In his study of national expenditures, General Garfield strove to discover the law by which they increase and diminish. He saw that, in time of peace, the best gauge, in a given state of civilization, is population. But it does not cost as much *per capita* to govern twenty million people as one million. Hence, while population tends to increase by a geometrical ratio, expenditures should increase only by an arithmetical ratio. The amount *per capita* should fall off. European countries, whose population does not expand territorially, but only increases in density, follow this law. So statistics teach. But in a country like ours the territorial element plays an important part. Thus far our boundaries have continued to widen and new States to be organized, both in the old territory and in the new. He found, therefore, that two main forces act in the ordinary movement of our expenditures: the natural growth of population, and the extension of our territory and increase in the number of our States. He held further that, while the ordinary expenditures would tend to increase from year to year after the Nation had reached the bottom of the inclined plane reaching downward from the war, "they ought not to increase by the same per cent. from year to year; the *rate* of increase ought gradually to grow less." He next inquired concerning the effect of wars on national expenditures, finding them a disturbing element of enormous power. The whole inquiry involved a most difficult inductive investigation.

The following paragraphs from his speech of January 23, 1872, "Public Expenditures, their Increase and Diminution," show the conclusions reached:

Throughout our history there may be seen a curious uniformity in the movement of the annual expenditures for the years immediately following a war. We have not the data to determine how long it was, after the war of Independence, before the expenditures ceased to decrease, that is, before they reached the point where their natural growth more than balanced the tendency to reduction of war expenditure; but in the years immediately following all our subsequent wars, the decrease has continued for a period almost exactly twice the length of the war itself.

After the war of 1812-'15, the expenditures

continued to decline for eight years, reaching the lowest point in 1823.

After the Seminole War, which ran through three years, 1836, 1837, 1838, the new level was not reached until 1844, six years after its close.

After the Mexican War, which lasted two years, it took four years (until 1852) to reach the new level of peace.

It is, perhaps, unsafe to base our calculations for the future on these analogies; but the wars already referred to have been of such varied character, and their financial effects have been so uniform, as to make it not unreasonable to expect that a similar result will follow our late war. If so, the decrease of national expenditures, exclusive of the principal and interest of the public debt, will continue until 1875 or 1876.

It will be seen by an analysis of our current expenditures that, exclusive of charges on the public debt, nearly \$50,000,000 are expenditures directly for the late war. Many of these expenditures will not appear again, such as the bounty and back pay of volunteer soldiers, and payment of illegal captures of British vessels and cargoes. We may reasonably expect that the expenditures for pensions will hereafter steadily decrease, unless our legislation should be unwarrantably extravagant. We may also expect a large decrease in expenditures for the Internal Revenue Department. Possibly we may ultimately be able to abolish that department altogether. In the accounting and disbursing bureaus of the Treasury Department, we may also expect a further reduction of the force now employed in settling war claims.

We can not expect so rapid a reduction of the public debt, and its burden of interest, as we have witnessed for the last three years; but the reduction will doubtless continue, and the burden of interest will constantly decrease. I know it is not safe to attempt to forecast the future, but I venture to express the belief that, if peace continues, the year 1876 will witness our ordinary expenditures reduced to \$185,000,000, and the interest on our public debt to \$95,000,000, making our total expenditures, exclusive of payment on the principal of the public debt, \$280,000,000. Judging from our own experience, and from that of other nations, we may not hope, thereafter, to reach a lower figure.

In an article contributed to the "North American Review" for June, 1879, General Garfield quoted these paragraphs, and then discussed them. Seven years had passed

since he had announced his law in 1872. This is his discussion:

Reviewing the subject in the light of subsequent experience, it will be seen that the progress of reduction of expenditures from the war level has been very nearly in accordance with these expectations of seven years ago.

The actual expenditures since the war, including interest on the public debt, as shown by the official record, were as follows:

1865, \$1,297,555,224 41	1872, \$277,517,962 67
1866, 520,809,416 99	1873, 290,845,245 33
1867, 357,542,675 16	1874, 287,133,873 17
1868, 377,340,234 86	1875, 274,623,392 84
1869, 322,865,277 80	1876, 258,159,797 83
1870, 309,653,560 75	1877, 238,660,008 93
1871, 292,177,188 25	1878, 236,964,326 80

Omitting the first of these years, in which the enormous payments to the army swelled the aggregate of expenses to \$1,297,000,000, and beginning with the first full year after the termination of the war, it will be seen that the expenditures have been reduced, at first very rapidly, and then more slowly, from \$520,000,000 in 1866 to about \$237,000,000 in 1878.

The estimate quoted above was that in 1876 expenditures would be reduced to \$230,000,000, including \$95,000,000 for interest on the public debt. In 1877, one year later than the estimated date, the actual reduction had reached \$238,000,000, including \$97,000,000 for interest on the public debt. [He means the expenditures *had been reduced* to \$238,000,000.]

It is evident that in 1877 we had very nearly reached the limit of possible reduction, for the aggregate expenditures of 1878 show a reduction below that of the preceding year of less than \$2,000,000; and the expenditures, actual and estimated, for the current year ending June 30, 1879, are \$240,000,000. It thus appears that 1878 was the turning-point from which, under the influence of the elements of normal growth, we may expect a constant, though it ought to be a small, annual increase of expenditures.

Probably this comes as near to scientific statesmanship as anything our country has seen. The speech of 1872, and two others, called "Revenues and Expenditures," March 5, 1874, and "Appropriations of the Forty-third Congress," June 23, 1874, come the nearest of anything in the American Congress to being what, in England, are called "Budget speeches."

April 8, 1874, General Garfield made a

speech in the House entitled "Currency and the Public Faith," against Mr. Maynard's bill to provide for free banking. This bill was the wild inflation scheme, the veto of which by President Grant, April 22, 1874, met with such hearty approval. The President characterized the bill as "a departure from true principles of finance, national interest, national obligations to creditors, Congressional promises, party pledges on the part of both political parties, and of personal views and promises made" by himself in all his annual messages and in each of his inaugural addresses.

General Garfield bore an important part in the legislation of 1871 to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment. That was the day of the Ku-Klux Klan, and large districts of the South were full of violence and outrage. Friends of the Union and of liberty generally felt that whatever the National Government could do, within the powers of the Constitution, to afford protection to Southern Unionists, white and black, should be done. Southern Republicans, especially, demanded that something should be done to prevent the wholesale disfranchisement of citizens in many Southern States. A very stringent measure to reach this end was brought forward in Congress. It went so far as to authorize the President to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus*, to declare martial law, and to enroll the militia, if he deemed it necessary, to aid the regular army. General Garfield shared fully the opinion of his party, to the effect that all the power of the General Government should be invoked to check violence and to protect citizens. But he recoiled from what he deemed the extreme features of the pending bill. In a very able speech, entitled "Enforcement of the Fourteenth Amendment," April 4, 1871, he went over the whole ground of the discussion. This is his introduction:

Mr Speaker, I am not able to understand the mental organization of the man who can consider this bill, and the subject of which it treats, as free from very great difficulties. He must be a man of very moderate abilities, whose ignorance is bliss, or a man of transcendent genius, whom no difficulties can daunt and whose clear vision no cloud can obscure.

The distinguished gentleman (Mr. Shellabar-

ger) who introduced the bill from the Committee very appropriately said that it requires us to enter upon unexplored territory. That territory, Mr. Speaker, is the neutral ground of all political philosophy; the neutral ground for which rival theories have been struggling in all ages. There are two ideas so utterly antagonistic that when, in any nation, either has gained absolute and complete possession of that neutral ground, the ruin of that nation has invariably followed. The one is that despotism which swallows and absorbs all power in a single central government; the other is that extreme doctrine of local sovereignty which makes nationality impossible, and resolves a general government into anarchy and chaos. It makes but little difference as to the final result which of these ideas drives the other from the field; in either case, ruin follows.

The result exhibited by the one was seen in the Amphictyonic and Achaean leagues of ancient Greece, of which Madison, in the twentieth number of "The Federalist," says:

The inevitable result of all was imbecility in the government, discord among the provinces, foreign influences and indignities, a precarious existence in peace, and peculiar calamities in war.

This is a fitting description of all nations who have carried the doctrine of local self-government so far as to exclude the doctrine of nationality. They were not nations, but mere leagues bound together by common consent, ready to fall to pieces at the demand of any refractory member. The opposing idea was never better illustrated than when Louis XIV entered the French Assembly, booted and spurred, and girded with the sword of ancestral kings, and said to the deputies of France, "The State! I am the State!"

Between these opposite and extreme theories of government, the people have been tossed from century to century; and it has been only when these ideas have been in reasonable equipoise, when this neutral ground has been held in joint occupancy, and usurped by neither, that popular liberty and national life have been possible. How many striking illustrations of this do we see in the history of France! The despotism of Louis XIV, followed by a reign of terror, when liberty had run mad and France was a vast scene of blood and ruin! We see it again in our day. Only a few years ago the theory of personal government had placed in the hands of Napoleon III absolute and irresponsible power. The communes of France were crushed, and local liberty existed no longer. Then followed Sedan and the rest. On the first day of last month, when France was trying to rebuild her ruined government, when

the Prussian cannon had scarcely ceased thundering against the walls of Paris, a deputy of France rose in the National Assembly and moved as the first step toward the safety of his country, that a committee of thirty should be chosen, to be called the Committee of Decentralization. But it was too late to save France from the fearful reaction from despotism. The news comes to us, under the sea, that on Saturday last the cry was ringing through France, "Death to the priests, and death to the rich!" and the swords of the citizens of that new republic are now wet with each other's blood.

His range of argument can best be shown by quoting his own subheads: "Equipoise of our Government," "Local Self-Government," "Protection of Persons and Property before the Late Amendment," "Protection of Persons and Property under the Late Amendment," "First Section of the Fourteenth Amendment," "The Rejected Amendment," "The Amendment as Adopted," "The Rejected and Adopted Amendments Compared," "Powers Granted in the First Section," "Citizenship," "Privileges and Immunities of Citizens of the United States," "Guarantees of Life, Liberty, and Property," "Equal Protection of the Laws," "Enforcement of the Amendments," "Bill to Enforce the Fourteenth Amendment," "Martial Law."

This speech was very distasteful to the majority of his party in the House, perhaps also in the country. Southern Republicans particularly spoke of it with bitterness. For a time it looked as though the party might split on this question. However, Mr. Garfield did not stand alone; enough of the leading members of his party stood with him to prevent the passage of the bill. The inside party history of that day need not be here given. Finally, a compromise was effected; the features of the bill to which he objected were cut away; the new bill passed, and became a law April 20, 1871. This speech put its author for a time against his party. It is at once a testimony to his sympathy for Southern Unionists, to the moderation of his views, to his dislike of military methods in time of peace, and to his wisdom. Probably few men can be found today, who regret that his views prevailed in the contest of 1871. Two other Congress-

sional speeches of this period are these: "National Aid to Education," February 6, 1872, characterized already, and "Cheap Transportation and Railways," June 22, 1874.

It was in this period of four years that Mr. Garfield performed a delicate but important public service in the Far West. Many years before, the Flathead Indians, long residents of the Bitter-Root Valley, Montana, had agreed to leave that valley and remove to the Jocko Reservation on the call of the Government. The time had now come, in the judgment of the Washington authorities, for the removal to be made. But the Flatheads were very unwilling to go. They were deeply attached to their ancestral home. The matter was still further complicated by the action of many of the settlers who had reached that wild region. These were anxious to bring on a war, both that the Flatheads might be exterminated, and that they might themselves fatten on the spoils of an Indian war. These Indians were a superior tribe; their history is of peculiar interest, but can not be here recited. General Garfield was sent out as a Special Commissioner in the summer of 1873; and he conducted the difficult business intrusted to him with such ability, that their removal to the Jocko Reservation was effected without bloodshed.

It was in the Forty-second Congress that the *Crédit Mobilier* developments, which so alarmed and aroused the country, were made. It was also at the very close of this Congress that the increase of salaries was enacted. The third of the current "charges" against General Garfield—the *De Golyer pavement*—came later. These matters will receive full consideration further on; but it will be well here to follow them through the politics of his own district and State.

The Western Reserve is Northeast Ohio. It was originally settled by New Englanders, and its population has the thrift, the keen intelligence, the habits of local self-government, the political instincts, and the morals of New England. The mail-clerks on Mr. Vanderbilt's railroad say that there is no population of equal numbers on the long line reaching from New York to Chicago that writes and reads so many letters, and that

receives so much reading matter through the mails.

The Nineteenth Ohio Congressional District is the eastern part of the Reserve. Probably it has retained the New England blood and traditions in a higher degree of purity than any other part. It early became deeply interested in the Anti-slavery movement; and this greatly quickened the interest of the people in public affairs. What is more, this district had formed a set of most valuable traditions of its own. In 1823 it elected Ehsha Whittlesey to Congress, and kept him there until 1839, a period of sixteen years. Mr. Whittlesey may not have been a man of extraordinary mental force, but he was a man of clear intelligence, of trained ability, and of varied knowledge. Above all, no man of greater probity ever sat in the halls of legislation. It was his unsullied honesty, more than his ability, that led President Taylor to appoint him Comptroller of the Treasury, an office that he held through two Presidential terms. Here, by his unquestioned honesty, he, first of all men as far as I know, won the name of "Watchdog of the Treasury." On the retirement of Mr. Whittlesey from Congress, Joshua R. Giddings steps upon the scene. He represents the district twenty years and then retires. Mr. Giddings was one of the old Anti-slavery leaders; to borrow a figure from one of Garfield's old speeches, Giddings was always found, like the white plume of Navarre, in the front of the battle. He was a man of great ability, probity, and honor. The marked political character of the Nineteenth District was formed during the eight terms of Mr. Whittlesey and the ten terms of Mr. Giddings. No district in the Union had a larger Republican majority, and it stood correspondingly high in all the elements of political character. No constituency, in all the particulars named, could appeal more strongly to the ambition of a Republican statesman.

Nowhere did the *Mobilier* and Salary matters make a deeper impression than on this most sensitive and jealous constituency. General Garfield had now represented it in five successive Congresses; and, although not then so well known as he is to-day, his name had crossed the continent to the West

and the ocean to the East. The District felt very proud of him. He was nominated the first time by a small majority; the second time without opposition. His third and fourth nominations were vigorously contested, but he triumphed so easily and so decisively that opposition fled the field, and left him in secure possession. No Representative held his constituency with a firmer hand. His tenure promised to be as long as that of Whittlesey or even Giddings. But now all was changed. A Republican convention, that met at Warren for some local purpose, demanded his resignation. Most men denounced, all regretted, none defended what had been done. All that the staunchest friends of General Garfield presumed to do was to say: "Wait until you hear the case; hear what Garfield has to say before you determine that he is a dishonest man."

General Garfield issued his pamphlets, "Review of the Transactions of the Crédit Mobilier Company" and "Increase of Salaries," from Washington, and then came on to Hiram. These pamphlets, with a personal speech in Warren somewhat later, constituted his direct defense. When the next campaign opened, he went as usual upon the stump. He discussed the charges against himself when there was occasion to do so. For the rest, he grappled with the questions of the day. He went from county to county, and almost from village to village. His knowledge was so great, his argumentation so logical, his spirit so earnest, and his bearing, both public and private, so manly, that men began to ask: "Can it be true that Mr. Garfield is such a man as they tell us?" Prejudice yielded rapidly in some places, slowly in others, but surely in all. The next campaign it was the same thing over. Garfield had now to be returned himself or leave public life. After a struggle that shook the District, he was nominated by a three-fourths vote of the Convention. Two years later the resistance was less. By this time he had won back the masses. Only those who had been very violent in opposition now stood out. These had to be won back, one by one. Two years later there was no opposition whatever; the District had been recaptured.

In 1878 he was reelected by his old-time majority. Opposition was now no more. Men who had been most denunciatory were now warmest in his praise; and it was actually left to the friends who had stood by him through all the storm to supply such criticism as every public man needs to keep him in proper tone. When the Senatorship question came up in the fall of 1879, the Republicans of the Nineteenth District had but one objection to his election—unwillingness to lose him as their Representative. And now that he is on the way to the chair of Washington, I may say no equal population between the two oceans will give him a greater majority than this old constituency.

Nor should I fail to mark how the victory was won, how the District was recaptured. It was not accomplished by management. James A. Garfield is no "manager." It was not by flattering the people and appealing to popular passions. General Garfield is no demagogue. It was by the earnest, straightforward exposition of solid political doctrine; it was by the high bearing of the man; in a word, it was by the impact of his mental and moral power upon intelligent and honest minds.

I may go further, and say, as it was in the District, so it was in the State. In a sense, in 1873, he had come to be the Representative of Ohio. He passed through a State as well as a district ordeal, and came out approved. As respects his thoroughgoing integrity, sincerity, and patriotism in all these transactions, there was now no shadow of doubt left on the minds of the great majority of his immediate constituents and of the good people of the State.

VI.

The Forty-fourth Congress, 1875-77.

With General Grant's second administration a great political change set in. In fact it began before the close of his first administration; and it would have shown itself with marked power in the canvass of 1872 had it not been for the grotesque appearance made by Mr. Greeley's running for President on a Democratic ticket. This reaction only temporarily checked in 1872, set in again with more power than ever; so that in 1874 the Democrats, the first time since 1861

gained control of the House of Representatives. For twelve years General Garfield had sat in a Republican House; now he saw the Democrats come to the front, while the Republicans marched to the rear. Since that day, in three successive Congresses, he has been in the minority. His new situation suggests some interesting reflections.

When the Republicans took control of the Government in 1861, their leaders, as a class, had had no experience in constructive politics. They were mighty in pulling down; to build up, they had never tried. The fourteen years following, an enormous amount of constructive work was done, most of it by the new men referred to in a previous section of this chapter. Although the Republicans were reduced to a minority in the House, they did not become a proper opposition. Immediately the Democrats addressed themselves to destroying, or attempting to destroy, much that had been done. To some extent they were sobered by the sense of responsibility; but they so used their newfound power as to alarm the conservative instincts of the country. Democrats love to call themselves Conservatives, and Republicans, Radicals, but, in the better sense, the names should be reversed. The elements of violence and recklessness are preponderatingly in the Democratic party; while the Republicans have a far larger share of the conservative intelligence of society. So it happened that the Republicans in the House, and General Garfield with them, have had for their principal work the defense of what had been accomplished, against the men who strove to prevent their accomplishing it in the first place.

Another change now took place. The *onus* of legislation fell upon the Democrats. All the chairmen of committees were Democrats. Consequently, no Republican was so tied to committee-work as he had been before. Especially was this true of those who, like General Garfield, had been heads of important committees. With no disposition to shrink duty, he now felt a sense of freedom that he had never had before. He could no longer do the same work for the country that he had done, even if he desired to do so. Then the great politico-economic questions, to which he had devoted

so much time, were beginning to approach settlement. Putting all these things together, we can understand why it is that more of his work has been political, in the party sense, since 1875 than before. He was placed on the Ways and Means Committee in 1875, to which also he has been assigned in each succeeding Congress.

At the close of the war, a large number of the people of the South were laboring under political disabilities. These were rapidly removed by Presidential proclamations and by legislation. It is quite the fashion to speak of the severity with which the Republicans treated the South. As a matter of fact, no other people, under similar circumstances, were ever treated with so much clemency. Still there were several classes of men to whom the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution applied; and their disabilities could be removed only by legislation. Legislative clemency was extended to these, as individuals or as classes, from time to time, until, in 1876, only seven hundred and fifty remained. Immediately on getting control of the House, the Democrats undertook, by law, to grant amnesty to these persons. They were told by the Republican leaders in the House that, if they would except the Confederate President, the Republicans would not oppose the bill. This they declined, and the debate began. Mr. Blaine made an aggressive speech in opposition to the bill, in which he charged upon Jefferson Davis complicity in the Andersonville and other similar outrages. Hon. B. H. Hill of Georgia replied in a speech of extraordinary power and bitterness. He made a general attack upon the conduct of the Government, denied that Union soldiers had been starved and murdered in rebel prisons, and asserted that rebel soldiers had been cruelly treated in Northern prisons, especially in the one at Elmira, New York. January 12, 1876, Mr. Garfield replied to Mr. Hill in a powerful speech. He began with deprecating the course that the debate had taken. Then he went on to state the real point at issue. Referring to the speakers on the Democratic side, he said: "Any one who reads these speeches would not suspect that they were debating a simple proposition to relieve some citizens of political

and legal disabilities incurred during the war. For example, had I been a casual reader, and not a listener, I should say that the chief proposition yesterday was an arraignment of the administration of this Government during the last fifteen years." He also deprecated the manner and spirit in which the Amnesty bill was brought forward and urged. He spoke in a conciliatory spirit of the great body of the Southern people, while insisting that they were wrong and the Nation right; they disloyal and the Nation loyal. Next, he declared that, as respected the measure under consideration, all were agreed concerning every human being of the seven hundred and fifty, save one. He then stated the question as to Davis thus :

I do not object to Jefferson Davis because he was a conspicuous leader. Whatever we may believe theologically, I do not believe in the doctrine of vicarious atonement in politics. Jefferson Davis was no more guilty for taking up arms than any other man who went into the rebellion with equal intelligence. But this is the question: In the high court of war did he practice according to its well-known laws—the laws of nations? Did he, in appealing to war, obey the laws of war; or did he so violate those laws, that justice to those who suffered at his hands demands that he be not permitted to come back to his old privileges in the Union? That is the whole question; and it is as plain and fair a question for deliberation as was ever debated in this House.

He now went on to determine the facts: Were there atrocities practiced in the Southern prisons? And if so, was the Confederate President responsible? He sustained the affirmative of both propositions with an array of overwhelming proofs. The charge of Davis's complicity in the atrocities of Andersonville he supported by a mass of evidence, much of it from rebel sources, that can leave no doubt of the fact upon any candid man capable of weighing testimony. He also disproved in the most convincing manner the charge of cruelty to Confederate soldiers in the Northern prisons. This speech settled the question. Immediately the bill was withdrawn, and has not since been renewed. He closed with the following words:

And now, Mr Speaker, I close as I began. Toward those men who gallantly fought us on the field I cherish the kindest feeling. I feel a sincere reverence for the soldierly qualities they displayed on many a well-fought battle-field. I hope the day will come when their swords and ours will be crossed over many a doorway of our children, who will remember the glory of their ancestors with pride. The high qualities displayed in that conflict now belong to the whole Nation. Let them be consecrated to the Union, and its future peace and glory. I shall hail that consecration as a pledge and symbol of our perpetuity.

But there was a class of men referred to in the speech of the gentleman yesterday for whom I have never yet gained the Christian grace necessary to say the same thing. The gentleman said that, amid the thunder of battle, through its dim smoke, and above its roar, they heard a voice from this side saying, "Brothers, come!" I do not know whether he meant the same thing, but I heard that voice behind us. I heard that voice, and I recollect that I sent one of those who uttered it through our lines—a voice owned by Vallandigham. General Scott said, in the early days of the war, "When this war is over, it will require all the physical and moral power of the Government to restrain the rage and fury of the non-combatants." It was that non-combatant voice behind us that cried "Halloo!" to the other side; that always gave cheer and encouragement to the enemy in our hour of darkness. I have never forgotten and have not yet forgiven those Democrats of the North whose hearts were not warmed by the grand inspirations of the Union, but who stood back, finding fault, always crying disaster, rejoicing at our defeat, never glorying in our victory. If these are the voices the gentleman heard, I am sorry he is now united with those who uttered them.

But to those most noble men, Democrats and Republicans, who together fought for the Union, I commend all the lessons of charity that the wisest and most beneficent men have taught.

I join you all in every aspiration that you may express to stay in this Union, to heal its wounds, to increase its glory, and to forget the evils and bitterness of the past; but do not, for the sake of the three hundred thousand heroic men who, maimed and bruised, drag out their weary lives, many of them carrying in their hearts horrible memories of what they suffered in the prison-pen—do not ask us to vote to put back into power that man who was the cause of their suffering—that man still unweakened, unshriven, unforgiven, undefended.

Near the close of the long session of the Forty-fourth Congress, Hon. L. Q. C. Lamar, of Mississippi, made a carefully prepared and very able speech on what may be called general politics. He began with deploring the evils of party, asserted his belief that the majority of the American people were tired of party prejudices; that they greatly desired to put an end to public corruption, and to reform the legislative and administrative evils of the Government. He declared that the national administration was very corrupt; that the civil service was in a deplorable state; and that the people could not make reforms because the one hundred thousand civil office-holders, and the one hundred thousand expectants of such offices, would not let them. He said the Republican party was incapable of making the reforms, hence, he inferred that the Democrats should once more be brought into power. He said that there was no reason to distrust the South; that the South was prostrate, broken in her industries and in her power, while the North was rich and powerful; and they had united with the Democratic party because they could go nowhere else for help and protection. He strove to allay all apprehensions in case the Democracy once more gained the control of the Government. He gave also a beautiful picture of the peace and security of the colored race in the South. Mr. Lamar's purpose was to make a speech that should influence public sentiment, especially Northern sentiment, in the pending Presidential election. He strove to make it as conciliatory as was possible to a man of his temper and history. There was reason to think that he postponed his speech till near the end of the session, so as to prevent an adequate reply. Throughout, the speech was an aggressive and powerful arraignment of the Republican party. Mr. Garfield had received an intimation that the speech was coming; so, when Mr. Lamar closed, he rose to reply. Other matters occupied the attention of the House the next day. August 4th he made the speech—one of the ablest of its kind that he has ever delivered—"Can the Democratic Party be safely intrusted with the Administration of the Government?" He began by expressing his appreciation of all that portion

of Lamar's speech which had for its object the removal of prejudices and unkindly feelings springing out of the war. He then summed up the whole speech in a masterly manner.

Next he pointed out that Mr. Lamar's speech was one of attack; that he had wholly failed, not only to answer, but to ask, the question: "Can the Democratic party be trusted with the Government?" He then addressed himself to this question, and, in a masterly review of our political history, showed that the war was one of ideas—freedom and slavery; that out of slavery grew the narrow States'-rights theory and disunion; that the Republican party had been the party of liberty and progress, while the Democrats had, at every step, been the party of obstruction and resistance. He produced abundant proofs that the South was full of violence and lawlessness; that the people lately in arms against the Government had accepted the results of the war no further than physical force coerced them; and that even then, if it were in their power, they would attempt a reversal of what had been done. He asserted that the Southern people had made a great mistake in confiding their fortunes to the Democratic party. No summary can do justice to this masterly speech. Like the reply to Mr. Hill, it was widely reproduced in the newspapers, and scattered by the hundred thousand copies in pamphlet editions.

December 19th following, at the last session of this Congress, Mr. Garfield made one of the finest of his commemorative speeches, "John Winthrop and Samuel Adams." This will be more fully referred to in another place.

We come now to a series of transactions that will long remain the subject of vehement and passionate controversy: the Presidential canvass and election of 1876. Mr. Garfield's part in two of these transactions will now be presented in as brief a narrative as is consistent with clearness, and with as little color as possible.

The election of 1876 was strenuously contested at every point. Believing that their continuance in power was required by the best interests of the country, the Republicans strove to elect their candi-

date. Insisting that the same interests demanded the ejection of the Republicans from the seats of power and their own enthronement, the Democrats did their utmost to carry the day. When the smoke of November 7th had lifted from the field, this was the situation that presented itself: There were in all three hundred and sixty-nine electors. Concerning one hundred and eighty-four Tilden electors and one hundred and sixty-six Hayes electors, there was no controversy. Unfortunately the remaining nineteen were in doubt. The Democrats claimed them, and the Republicans claimed them. If these should be counted for Mr. Tilden, that gentleman would be elected by a majority of eighteen; if for Mr. Hayes, he would be elected by a majority of one. The nineteen electors were those of South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana. The elements of uncertainty out of which the later controversy grew were different in the different States. In Florida there were technical questions of form; in Louisiana fraud and intimidation were charged. It is difficult to imagine a state of political affairs more likely to engender passion and provoke questionable practices on both sides. For the rest, this narrative will be confined to the State of Louisiana, because Mr. Garfield had nothing to do with either of the other States.

Hon. A. S. Hewitt, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, requested a number of prominent Democrats from different States to go to New Orleans to witness the counting, by the State Returning Board, of the popular vote for Presidential electors. President Grant also requested a number of prominent Republicans to go for a similar purpose. Mr. Garfield was one of those invited. He had reached Washington from Ohio November 9th, and the President's dispatch from Philadelphia reached him the evening of the next day. This is the dispatch: "I would be gratified if you would go to New Orleans, to remain until the vote of Louisiana is counted. Governor Kellogg requests that reliable witnesses be sent to see that the canvass is a fair one. Answer." He replied that he could not go immediately, and that he would see the President on his return to Washington. At the interview held the next evening, the

President stated more fully the objects to be gained by the embassy. The presence of well-known Northern citizens in New Orleans might serve to calm the agitation of the public mind. It was desirable to have some just-minded men present at the counting of the votes. Besides, Senators and Representatives could discuss the whole subject more intelligently in Congress, where it was sure to come up at the opening of the session, from having familiarized themselves with it by such a visit. Hitherto General Garfield had hesitated. On personal grounds it was very inconvenient for him to go, and he saw that his going might subject him to unfavorable criticism. But when he had fully learned what the President's purposes were—especially when he learned that he was to be associated with such distinguished and honorable men as John Sherman, Courtland Parker, Stanley Matthews, E. W. Stoughton, and others—his general objections were removed, and he consented to go. He reached New Orleans November 14th. The Democratic visitors, and some of the Republicans, had already arrived.

On the 15th the Republican Committee received a communication from the Democratic Committee proposing that the two committees should unite, in order that such influence as they possessed might "be exerted in behalf of such a canvass of the votes actually cast as, by its fairness and impartiality, shall command the respect and acquiescence of the American people of all parties." This overture was declined for a reason which can not be understood without some knowledge of the electoral law of Louisiana.

In most of the States votes are canvassed in the places where they are cast. The judges of the election are the canvassers of the votes. Not only do these judges decide, under the law, as ballots are offered, who are entitled to vote, but they canvass and count the votes. If more votes are found in the box than there are names on the list, it is the duty of these canvassers, under the law, to purge the ballot-box. When their canvass and count are finished, they send the returns to the proper officers. When the returns reach the State Capital, in the case of State officers and Presidential electors, nothing re-

mains to be done but to put the returns from all the precincts together, to add up the columns of figures, and to publish the results. In no proper sense is there a State Board of Canvassers. Of course the law provides a remedy in case there has been fraud in any quarter. Such is the common procedure. But the State of Louisiana, years before the election of 1876, had ordained a different method of canvassing and counting votes. The ballots cast in all the precincts were to be sent in packages, properly authenticated by signatures and protected by seals, to a board of State canvassers, called a Returning Board. It was made the business of this Board to canvass all the votes, to count those that were found to be legal, and to make known the result. Questions of illegal voting that in Ohio and New York are settled by the local judges of elections, in Louisiana were settled by the State Board at the Capital of the State. The law further provided the requisite machinery for taking testimony in disputed elections, both in the parishes and at the Capital. The circumstances that led to the enacting of this law need not be here recounted. Nor need the necessity of the law itself be canvassed. Every man is entitled to his own opinion, both as to the necessity and wisdom of the law. All that need be insisted on here is this: *Such was the law of Louisiana in 1876*, and such it had been for years. The courts had often given it judicial interpretation. Accordingly it was the duty of the Board to determine, under the law and in view of all the testimony, what votes were legal. So the Republican Committee replied to the Democratic that the functions of the Canvassing Board were in some cases judicial as well as ministerial; and that the Visiting Committee could not unite in an effort to influence the Board on behalf of "a canvass of the votes actually cast." They replied furthermore, that they had nothing whatever to do with influencing the Board; that an attempt on their part so to influence them would be an unwarrantable interference; and that they were in Louisiana simply as witnesses of the canvass and count.

The situation in Louisiana, to be more specific, was this: If all the votes forwarded from the voting precincts to New Orleans

were counted, the Tilden electors were elected. But the Republicans of the State claimed that there had been gross fraud and intimidation in some parts of the State; and that, if the votes were canvassed according to the law, the Hayes electors had been chosen. The law expressly declared it to be the duty of the Board, if they found that riot, tumult, acts of violence, intimidation, armed disturbances, treachery, or corrupt influences had materially interfered with the purity and freedom of the election at any poll or voting place, or prevented a sufficient number of the qualified electors thereat from registering and voting materially to change the result of the said election, then they were not to count the votes from such precinct, but were to exclude them from the returns. In most of the parishes there were no contests; but there were contests growing out of alleged fraud and intimidation in several of the parishes. The whole issue depended upon the decision in these contested parishes. If the votes actually cast in these precincts were counted, the Tilden electors were chosen beyond question; but if the votes were thrown out, because illegal, the Hayes electors. The Board was to be guided by the law and the testimony. The testimony had already been taken when the visitors reached New Orleans, and was in the form of affidavits.

The Returning Board now furnished each of the Committees with copies of all the testimony. To secure a thorough examination and analysis of the documents, the Republicans distributed the testimony relating to the different parishes among themselves. To General Garfield was assigned West Feliciana. He took all the papers and went through them in that thorough manner which characterizes all his work. He caused some of the witnesses to be recalled and more thoroughly examined. Before he had finished his work on the documents the Board had begun its work. Five members of each Committee were allowed to be present at the canvass of the votes—five Republicans and five Democrats, each with a stenographer. The bundles of votes were opened in the order prescribed by law, the certificates scrutinized, and the testimony showing fraud and intimidation, if any, considered.

Each Committee was permitted to make copies of all the papers. Questions were also allowed. Besides, the two Louisiana political Committees were represented by counsel, and contested points were argued. Such was the method of the canvass.

When the last parish had been dispatched, nothing remained for the Republican visitors to do but to return and submit to the President a report of what had been done. That evening General Garfield and most of the others left for the North. The Louisiana Board had still to decide the various points involved, to count up the votes, and to make known its decision. This was to be done, under the law, in secret session. The telegram announcing the result, and General Garfield, reached Washington about the same time.

This is the story of General Garfield's visit to New Orleans in the fall of 1876. This is the whole story. He kept aloof from all contests and quarrels of local politicians. He entered into no negotiations. He became a party to no bargains or understandings. All his conduct was as honorable as anything in his life. He performed no act in relation to the whole matter to which the full light of day can not be admitted. Improper acts have been charged against other gentlemen, whether rightly or wrongly does not here matter; but against General Garfield no whisper of such charge has ever been made. A year later, all these matters were gone over by the Potter Investigating Committee; all sources of information were exhausted; but no breath of accusation against General Garfield was ever breathed. Concerning his going to New Orleans *at all*, men may differ in opinion, as they may concerning the going of all the gentlemen, both Republicans and Democrats. It must be admitted that the business was delicate, in which a man could easily compromise himself if so disposed; and it is creditable to General Garfield that he so bore himself in relation to the Board and all other persons that not one act or word of his has been made the subject of unfriendly comment.

The next step in this history is the Electoral Commission, created by the law of January 29, 1877, entitled "An Act to pro-

vide for and regulate the Counting of Votes for President and Vice-President, and the Decision of Questions arising thereon, for the Term commencing March 4, 1877." The minor steps that led to this Act need not be here recounted. Nor need the law itself be stated further than to say, that it provided for a Commission of Fifteen—five Justices of the Supreme Court, five Senators, and five Representatives—whose duties were thus defined:

All the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes of each State shall be opened [that is, by the President of the Senate, in presence of the Senate and House of Representatives] in the alphabetical order of the States, as provided in section one of this Act; and when there shall be more than one such certificate or paper, as the certificates and papers from such State shall so be opened (excepting duplicates of the same return), they shall be read by the tellers, and thereupon the President of the Senate shall call for objections, if any. Every objection shall be made in writing, and shall state clearly and concisely, and without argument, the ground thereof, and shall be signed by at least one Senator and one member of the House of Representatives before the same shall be received. When all such objections so made to any certificate, vote, or paper from a State shall have been received and read, all such certificates, votes, and papers so objected to, and all papers accompanying the same, together with such objections, shall be forthwith submitted to said Commission, which shall proceed to consider the same, with the same powers, if any, now possessed for that purpose by the two Houses acting separately or together, and, by a majority of votes, decide whether any and what votes from such State are the votes provided for by the Constitution of the United States, and how many and what persons were duly appointed electors in such State, and may therein take into view such petitions, depositions, and other papers, if any, as shall, by the Constitution and now existing law, be competent and pertinent in such consideration; which decision shall be made in writing, stating briefly the ground thereof, and signed by the members of said Commission agreeing therein; whereupon the two Houses shall again meet, and such decision shall be read and entered in the journal of each House, and the counting of the votes shall proceed in conformity therewith, unless, upon objection made thereto in writing by at least five Senators and five members of the House of Representatives, the two Houses shall

separately concur in ordering otherwise; in which case such concurrent order shall govern. No votes or papers from any other State shall be acted upon until the objections previously made to the votes or papers from any State shall have been finally disposed of.

While the Electoral bill was pending in the House, Mr. Garfield delivered a speech, January 25, 1877, entitled "Counting the Electoral Vote." Whatever a man's opinions of the positions of this speech may be, as respects both their constitutionality and wisdom, he must admit that speeches as able are rarely heard in either House of Congress. He began with stating the gravity of the questions involved, as became the subject and the political emergency. Next he stated the difficulty that the fathers had in creating an executive head for the Nation. He mentioned the various plans that were proposed in the Convention of 1787 and abandoned. Then he considered the plan adopted and incorporated into the Constitution. This plan he then followed through the discussions subsequent, down to the ratification of the Constitution by the people of the States. This he followed up by a most vigorous criticism of the bill itself. He referred to the early practice of opening the certificates and counting the votes; and reinforced his argument by citing the practice in the States in publishing the returns of elections for Governors. Mr. Garfield's affirmative argument will be given at full length in another place. Here it will be well to summarize his main points:

1. Each State is to choose its electors in its own way. If this is by a popular election, the State determines the voting precincts, names the judges of election, and canvasses the vote. No power in the world is competent to go behind the returns to inquire what has been done. The Nation is bound irrevocably by the action and findings of the State.

2. Congress is in no sense a returning board. He denied that either Congress or the Houses had anything to do with the substance of opening the certificates and counting the votes. This was to him a great objection to the Electoral bill. "It makes Congress a vast irresponsible returning board, with all the vices of, and none of the

excuses for, the returning boards of the States." The Houses are present simply as witnesses of what is done. They might make rules as to the *manner* of proceeding—such as the employment of tellers, the order in which the certificates should be drawn—but nothing more.

3. The opening of the certificates and the counting of the votes is made the duty of the President of the Senate. As respects the substance of the proceeding, everything is in his breast. If there be two sets of papers, he is to decide between them. Of the regularity of the papers he is the sole judge.

4. If the President of the Senate abuse his trust, he may be impeached or otherwise proceeded against according to law. As respects him, there is no other than punitive redress.

5. But suppose he declares the wrong man elected? This question may be answered by another one: Suppose, on the theory that Congress counts the votes, that the wrong man is declared elected? The courts are open. Whatever can be legally done to correct what is wrong in the one case can be legally done in the other.

6. If any one recoil from this theory of the Constitution because it reposes too much power in one man—the President of the Senate—it can be replied, that it is far safer to repose the power and the responsibility in one man, who can be reached by legal process, than to repose them in the two Houses of Congress, consisting of several hundred members, swayed by all the storms of politics, that can not be reached by any legal process, and that are responsible only to public opinion.

Such was General Garfield's argument. However, the bill passed the Houses and became a law. The Electoral Commission was created, and did its work. It is in no sense the subject of comment here. The Republicans of the House unanimously designated Mr. Garfield as one of the Commissioners, and he was chosen. That he had opposed the creation of this tribunal no more precluded his sitting as one of its members than a judge, who denies the jurisdiction of the court of which he is a member in a given case, is precluded from sitting upon the case, if he is overruled. The

creation of the Commission was one thing; the questions to come before it, if created, quite another. Mr. Garfield sat in all the sessions of the Commission, and took an able part in all its deliberations. Two of its ablest arguments are his. The great question that came up for answer was the very question that he had raised in the House: What are the relations of the national authority to the State in choosing its electors? What are the powers of Congress, or of the Houses, if any? As he said in one of his speeches: "This Act confers no new powers upon the two Houses, but it makes the Commission the interpreter of the powers which they possessed before its passage." This question the Commission had now to decide, though its decision could be overruled by the two Houses acting jointly. After a thorough investigation of the whole subject, the Commission came to this opinion: There is no power that can go behind the returns of the State; when the national authority has identified the voice of the State, that voice is final, no matter what may have led to the State's determination. Hence the Commission refused to go behind the returns in any case, but held them conclusive as respects the national authority. In the proper sense this is States-rights doctrine. The Democrats antagonized it fiercely, and held to a theory that made Congress the canvasser and the judge of all that the State has done. Thus Mr. Garfield had the prescience to base his argument on solid ground. That ground is not likely to be abandoned in the future. At all events, it can not be without largely eliminating the element of local self-government from our political system.

It is now asserted by some of the Democratic organs that General Garfield violated his oath as a member of the Commission in this: The law creating the Commission, they assert, made it the duty of the Commission to go behind the returns; he took an oath to obey the law; and then he argued and voted against so doing. Those who make this charge must be either very ignorant, both of the law and its history, or very reckless. It was expressly left with the Commission to inquire whether Congress, and the Commission itself that was clothed with the power

of Congress, had such power. This was purposely left an open question, as Senator Thurman, himself one of the Commissioners, asserted on various occasions in the Senate January 24th, in advocating the measure, this Senator said:

Mr. President, this bill gives to this Commission the same powers that the Houses of Congress separately or together have, whatever those powers are. If constitutionally they may go behind the decision of a returning board, this Commission can go behind it; if constitutionally they can not go behind that decision, this Commission can not go behind it; and therefore it is a mere license of speech to call this a shuffling bill. You might as well call any bill, such as we often pass authorizing the Court of Claims to decide on a claim against the United States, or authorizing any other court to decide a claim, a shuffling bill, because in the act we pass we do not decide the case itself, but submit it to the judicial determination of the court.

I have as strong convictions on this subject perhaps, and as lawyer-like convictions, as any other member on this floor. I say to the Senator from Indiana that not sixty days ago, but six centuries ago, it was the law that the acts of everybody who acted without jurisdiction were utterly void. I hope that this tribunal that will be established will decide in the same way, and follow the precedents of six centuries; but I do not know, and I will not restrain them by any act of Congress.

Mr. Morton offered this amendment to the Electoral bill:

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall authorize the said Commission to go behind the finding and determination of the canvassing or returning officers of a State, authorized by the laws of the State to find and determine the result of an election for electors.

Mr. Edmunds, to test the question on all sides, offered this amendment to Mr. Morton's, declaring that he should himself vote against it:

That the said Commission shall have authority to go behind the finding and determination of the canvassing or returning officers, etc.

Mr. Thurman then said:

I shall vote against them both. I have a very strong and decided opinion, I may say, that to a certain extent the decision of a canvassing or returning board may be inquired into, gone

behind, in the language here used ; but whatever may be my opinion upon these subjects, I shall not vote for either of these propositions, because to attempt to decide either of them is to kill the bill.

Both amendments were lost, and the bill passed, leaving the Commission to inquire what power it had in the premises. Mr. Garfield held that neither Congress nor the Commission could go behind the action of a State. In so doing he no more violated his oath than Mr. Thurman, who took the opposite ground.

The death of Mr. Kerr, the Speaker of the House in the Forty-fourth Congress, made the election of a successor necessary. Mr. Blaine had already gone to the Senate, and Mr. Garfield was left the undisputed Republican leader. The election came on before his return from Louisiana. December 4, 1876, the Republicans in the House cast their votes for him as Speaker. It was nothing but a compliment, as the Democrats were in the ascendancy. Twice since has he been complimented in the same manner. It should also be added, that in four different Congresses he has been a member of the Committee on Rules. He took a prominent part in the revision of the rules by the present House.

VII.

Forty-fifth Congress, 1877-'79.

Again the candidate of his party for Speaker, again a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and still the Republican leader in the House.

It is curious to observe the groups in which General Garfield's speeches lie. No man can run over the list, in connection with the current political history, and not see that the bent of his mind would keep him in the field of politico-economic discussion and legislation. It is only when great crises arise, such as that produced by the Presidential election of 1876, its antecedents and consequents, and the attempt of the Democrats in 1879 to coerce the Executive, that he is strongly drawn to partisan politics. Thus, in the Forty-third Congress his great themes are "Revenues and Expenditures," "Currency and the Public Faith," "Appropriations of the First Session of the Forty-third

Congress," "Cheap Transportation and Railways." In the Forty-fourth Congress they are "Amnesty," "Can the Democratic Party safely be Intrusted with the Administration of the Government?" "Counting the Electoral Vote." In the Forty-fifth they are the "Repeal of the Resumption Law," "The New Scheme of American Finance," "The Tariff," and others that have no relations to parties. Here it may be said that, recently, questions affecting finance, industry, and trade have hardly been party questions at all. Men of all ways of thinking on these subjects have been found in both the political parties. It has been impossible to draw party lines by their bearings. Party lines have been drawn with sole reference to questions growing out of slavery and the war, though the method of interpreting the Constitution, whether strictly or loosely, has been an important factor. This somewhat anomalous state of affairs explains why it is that some of Mr. Garfield's most effective speeches have been addressed, in whole or in part, to Republicans.

By the time that President Hayes was seated in the chair of State, political passion had cooled; the public mind had been long overstrained; the Southern policy of the President satisfied, for the time, the majority of men, while the minority, partly from exhaustion and partly from awe, acquiesced in silence. A blessed repose that the people much needed fell upon the country. The subsidence of party politics, the calm of the country, the bent of his mind, and the movement of events take General Garfield once more to politico-economic questions.

January 1, 1879, the day fixed for the Resumption of Specie Payments by the Act of January 14, 1875, was but little more than a year off when the Forty-fifth Congress convened. At the special session held in the fall of 1877, the enemies of Resumption and the friends of soft money made one more determined effort to carry out their policy. General Ewing of Ohio introduced a repealing bill into the House, and once more the roar of financial battle was heard on the floors of Congress. No more determined attack upon the buttresses of national honor and prosperity had at any time been made. In the House debate, Mr. Garfield delivered

one of his ablest speeches, entitled "Repeal of the Resumption Law." This was his introduction :

We are engaged in a debate which has lasted in the Anglo-Saxon world for more than two centuries; and hardly any phase of it to which we have listened in the course of the last week is new. Hardly a proposition has been heard on either side which was not made one hundred and eighty years ago in England, and almost a hundred years ago in the United States. So singularly does history repeat itself.

Once more he swept with a master's power this familiar field of discussion. He set forth the well-known doctrines of finance in which he is so firmly grounded. He drew upon the resources of all financial history for illustration; exploded the current fallacy that Resumption would bear heavily upon the poor, exploded, too, the fallacy that we have in any proper sense creditor and debtor classes with diverse interests; and closed with the declaration that he would favor any substitute for the bill which would make Resumption more safe, more certain, and would more carefully protect the business interests of the country; but that any measure which took back the promise, which gave up what had been gained, which set the country afloat upon the wild waves from which it had so nearly escaped, he would oppose to the utmost, confidently trusting to the future for the vindication of his judgment. But argument and remonstrance were not heeded. The Ewing bill passed the House, but, fortunately, could not command a majority in the Senate. Still we shall hear of it again after Resumption has become a fact. This speech led to a second, the history of which should also be given.

March 5, 1878, the Hon. W. D. Kelley of Pennsylvania, one hundred and nine days after Garfield's Resumption speech, made a lengthy speech, in which he sought not only to overturn the doctrines of that speech, but also indulged in the most offensive personal remarks. To make this speech, Mr. Kelley had arrested the work on the appropriation bills then pending. Mr. Garfield was unwilling to divert the House from the business in hand; but his manhood demanded that he should repel Mr. Kelley's wanton at-

tack. This he did in a speech delivered the next day, called "The New Scheme of American Finance." After turning that gentleman's personal remarks upon himself, with spirit but without bitterness, he launched out into a full review of the whole question. So perfect was his mastery of all the topics within the range of debate that, with only one night's preparation, he was able not only to answer, but to overwhelm Mr. Kelley on every point. The arguments *pro* and *con* will not be reproduced in this place. Mr. Kelley brought forward his well-known soft-money theories, and Mr. Garfield replied with the sound-money facts. Kelley's historical references were turned upon him in the most handsome manner. Perhaps the most telling point was when Mr. Garfield showed from the record that, in 1865, Mr. Kelley had himself voted for a resolution declaring a contraction of the currency a necessity, with a view to as early a resumption of specie payments as the business interests of the country would admit. The House enjoyed this speech intensely. The country broke out into guffaws of laughter. If Mr. Garfield enjoyed personal victories over men, which he does not, his satisfaction could not well be greater than in the discomfiture of his antagonist. Mr. Kelley only entangled himself more completely in his efforts to escape the toils into which he had fallen.

As Resumption was on the eve of accomplishment, the Honest-money League of the Northwest, having its headquarters in Chicago, thought fit to celebrate the great act and fact by a public meeting. Who was so fit to voice the history of the past, the feelings of the present, and the hopes of the future as James A. Garfield? He knew all the history, had passed through every stage of the long debate from 1863 to 1879, and, more than all, had been loyal to the honest-money flag in every contest. He was invited to deliver the address in the presence of the citizens of Chicago and the Northwest. He accepted the invitation, and redeemed his promise in "Suspension and Resumption of Specie Payments," delivered January 2, 1879. He began :

The Resumption of Specie Payments closes the most memorable epoch in our history since the

birth of the Union. Eighteen hundred and sixty-one and eighteen hundred and seventy-nine are the opposite shores of that turbulent sea, whose storms so seriously threatened with shipwreck the prosperity, the honor, and the life of the Nation. But the horrors and dangers of the middle passage have at last been mastered, and out of the night and tempest the Republic has landed on the shore of this new year, bringing with it union and liberty, honor and peace.

He then pointed out how our financial history for eighteen years had been a part of our war history, and raised the question, "Will our great sovereign, the people of all these States, make the decree irreversible? Will resumption be maintained?" Largely his address was an affirmative answer to this question. It calls for no summary here. The speech was worthy of the occasion, of the orator, and of Resumption itself. This is his eloquent close.

Reviewing the whole period, we have the right to say that the wisdom of our institutions has been vindicated, and our confidence in their stability has been strengthened. Legislation has been directed more and more to the enlargement of private rights and the promotion of the interests of labor. It has been devoted not to the glory of a dynasty, but to the welfare of a people. Slavery, with the aristocracy of caste which it engendered, and the degradation of labor which it produced, has disappeared. Without undue exultation we may declare that the bells of the new year

"Ring out a slowly dying cause,
And ancient forms of party strife;
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws."

We have learned the great lesson, applicable alike to nations and to men:

"Self-knowledge, self-reverence, self-control—
These three alone lead on to sovereign power."

But there was a farce following this grand financial drama that may be presented here, as presented on the Washington theatre. Mr. Ewing's bill to repeal the Resumption Act passed the House, November 22, 1877. It came back to the House, with important amendments, June, 1878. The attempt to suspend the rules, to concur in the Senate Amendments, and pass the bill—a motion that requires a two-thirds vote—failed, one hundred and forty to one hundred and twelve. February 22, 1879, nearly two

months after Resumption had been accomplished, Mr. Ewing made another attempt to carry his favorite measure. After a running discussion of some hours, it was buried under a motion to lay it on the table, carried by a vote of one hundred and forty-one to one hundred and ten. This vote showed how little sense Mr. Ewing had of the temper of the House, and also how great a change had come over Congress since June preceding. Some long and solemn orations were made on the sepulture of this fondly loved child. Mr. Garfield contributed to the obsequies a short jocular speech, in which he spoke of the bill as a "belated ghost," wandering back into these halls, revisiting the "glimpses of the moon," and awaking the old familiar echoes.

With one other form of financial folly, this long record of financial discussion and legislation will close.

Mr. Bland of Missouri brought forward his celebrated bill to authorize the coinage of the standard silver dollar, and to restore its legal-tender character, at the special session of the Forty-fifth Congress. As it passed the House, it authorized an unlimited coinage of the 412½-grain silver dollars. The Senate limited the coinage to four million dollars a month. The House concurred, the bill passed both Houses, and was vetoed by the President, February 28, 1878. The Houses promptly passed it over the veto, and it became a law. Small opportunity was given in the House to debate this bill at any stage. Mr. Garfield had carefully matured opinions upon the subject. He believed in bi-metallism. He believed that both silver and gold legal-tender coin were essential to the stability of the currency. But he had no faith in the coinage of the 412½-grain dollars, either in limited or unlimited quantities, for the simple reason that that amount of silver was not worth a dollar. Silver, owing to a variety of causes, had greatly declined in value since 1873; and there was no reason to suppose that it would soon, or greatly, appreciate—at least, not unless its general remonetization by the gold nations could be brought about. He saw that an inferior dollar of any kind could not fail to be a disturbing element in the currency. He thought the

Senate amendments were wise if the old dollar was to be recoined at all, and accordingly voted for them. But the Bland bill he voted against in all its stages. He prepared an elaborate speech on the bill, but had no opportunity to deliver it. His protest was condensed into three minutes, granted him by Mr. Stephens. It stands in "The Record" for February 28, 1878, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, every man who is opposed to the use of silver coin as a part of the lawful currency of the country, I disagree with. Every man who is opposed to the actual legal use of both metals, I disagree with. Every man who is in favor of any bill that will drive one of these metals out of circulation and give us only the other as money, with him I disagree. It is a matter of deep regret to me that on this greatest financial measure which has come before Congress for many years, we have come down at last to the turbulent scenes of this single hour, not of deliberation, but of experience meeting, without debate or opportunity for amendment.

The amendments which have come from the Senate are wise, so far as they go, and I shall vote for them all. If any man could convince me that the bill as it now stands would bring the silver and gold dollars to a substantial equality, I would not only vote for it with all my heart, but I would vote against the Senate amendments which forbid free coinage. I would endow the two dollars with equality, and make the coinage free. But no adequate discussion is allowed, and we are permitted no opportunity so to amend the bill as to secure that equality.

Believing, as I do—and I shall rejoice if the future proves me mistaken—believing, as I do, that this bill will not bring the two metals to equality, nor keep them there; that it will bring no relief to the suffering and distress which now afflict the country; that it will seriously injure the public credit, and thereby injure every citizen, I shall vote to lay the bill on the table.

In the month of June, 1878, culminated the attempt to shift the Tariff laws from Protective to Free Trade grounds. This culmination came in what is known as the "Wood bill." Hon. J. R. Tucker of Virginia made a very able speech in support of this measure. A few days later, June 4, 1878, Mr. Garfield replied in a speech on "The Tariff" that is the ablest of all his speeches on this subject. Mr. Tucker held that the two powers conferred by Congress,

to levy duties and to control commerce, are wholly distinct; that the great mistake had been made of attempting, through the taxing power, to regulate commerce and protect manufactures; that the power of taxation conferred by the Constitution had no reference to protecting industry. In short, all protection of domestic industry through the distribution of taxation was unconstitutional. This was Mr. Tucker's first point. Mr. Garfield began with expressing his admiration of the courage that brought Mr. Tucker into point-blank range of the terrible artillery of James Madison, one of the fathers of the Constitution, more than a hundred pages of whose collected works are devoted to an elaborate and exhaustive discussion of the very objections that Mr. Tucker had urged. Then followed those inevitable quotations from high authority with which Mr. Garfield has so often overwhelmed his antagonists. Passing from the Constitutional question, he went on to survey the whole field, reaching the well-known conclusions that he has maintained since his entry into public life.

Here I may violate chronological order, to follow Mr. Garfield's Tariff record to its close. February 26, 1879, he discussed in the House the "Sugar Tariff," in a speech on the House bill to regulate the duties on sugar. This is a special and not a general Tariff speech. The doctrine of Protection was not directly involved. The main question was, How shall the duties on imported sugar be regulated? It was a subject that called rather for expert knowledge than for general Tariff doctrines. His latest utterances on the Tariff are found in the speech "Pulp and Paper," May 1, 1880, and a report on "Hoop, Band, and Scroll Iron," presented by the minority of the Committee of Ways and Means, May 11, 1880.

In this Congress came the speeches, "Lincoln and Emancipation," "Joseph Henry," and "Relations of the National Government to Science." They are all of a class, and of a degree of excellence, that few politicians are capable of making. They come only from a cultivated mind and a great heart.

One further group of facts will complete this section.

President Hayes had not been long in his

seat before partisan politics began again to appear. The policy of the President did not satisfy the extreme men of the South. The Louisiana authorities began prosecutions against the members of the Returning Board of 1876. This was in direct contravention of the understanding arrived at in the spring of 1877. The Democratic party all over the country raised the cry of "fraud" against the Presidential election itself. The antecedents of the party, and its present temper, went to show that it was ready for almost any reckless venture. Withal, Republicans were deeply dissatisfied. Those at the South complained that they had been abandoned. Many at the North joined in this feeling. Besides, the President's administration of the civil service produced much dissatisfaction; a large number of Republicans felt that the President held himself aloof from his party; and there was no small danger of a split in the party ranks. Some of the more radical Republicans were ready, as respected the President's relations to the party, to go to extremes. Now it was that General Garfield's great qualities as a party leader shone forth with more luster than ever before. He defended the settlement of affairs that had been made in the Southern States. He was more than willing to support a real reform in the civil service. He did not doubt the purity and sincerity of the President's purposes. He greatly deprecated any division, in fact or in spirit, within the party. He counseled moderation. Fearing that an explosion might occur, he dissuaded against the holding of a party caucus. Seeing, finally, that the time for him to speak had come, February 19, 1878, he made his speech, "The Policy of Pacification, and the Prosecutions in Louisiana." In this speech he went over the subject in a manner well calculated to conciliate reasonable men, yet without disguising any of his own convictions. He said there were three stages between war and peace: first, the war stage, the period of military force, that closed, in our case, in the spring of 1865; second, the semi-military stage, presenting a mingling of civil and military elements, reaching to the close of President Grant's second term; third, the era of peace methods pure and simple, beginning with Mr. Hayes's adminis-

tration. He pointed out once more the distinction between loyalty and treason; deprecated the manner in which the South had received the olive branches of peace held out to them; asserted that the mass of Republicans had supported the President so far as they "had reason to believe that reciprocity of feeling and conduct would follow his efforts"; spoke with deserved severity of the Louisiana prosecutions; and warned the Democratic extremists against walking farther in the path in which they had started. Fortunately for the Republican party, and for the success of his effort at harmony, the Democrats came to the rescue. If they had had the requisite wisdom and moderation, it is more than probable that a split in the Republican ranks would have taken place. Fortunately for the Republicans, disastrously for themselves, they chose to follow the suggestions of violence and recklessness. The Potter investigation was launched, its purpose being to unsettle Mr. Hayes's title to the Presidential office. Later came the assaults upon the army and the election laws. The Republican ranks closed up to resist this common foe. Thus the way was made ready for the victories on the civic fields of 1878 and 1879. So the Republican army was put on an excellent footing for the great campaign of 1880. To no one is that army more indebted for this favorable turn in its affairs, than to its present standard-bearer.

VIII.

Forty-sixth Congress, 1879-'81.

No Congress for many years has been more excited and troubled than the Forty-sixth. In no other has General Garfield risen to such a commanding influence, both in the House and before the country. To set forth the nature and extent of his activity and influence, it will be necessary to deal with all the exciting questions that have arisen since the winter of 1878-'79.

At the last session of the Forty-fifth Congress, two of the twelve great appropriation bills failed to become laws, viz., the Army bill and the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial bill, together disposing of about forty-five million dollars. The cause of this failure must be explained.

The House of Representatives, in which the Democrats had a decided majority, insisted that three measures of distinct and independent legislation should be incorporated in the bills: the material modification of the laws relating to the use of the army; the repeal of the Juror's Test Oath; and the repeal of the laws regulating the elections of members of Congress. The Senate, in which the Republicans had a small majority, refused to incorporate these measures in the two bills. The closing hours of the session saw the two Houses at a deadlock. The Republicans made advances in the direction of a compromise, but only to be repelled. It was well known that the President, as well as the Senate, was opposed to the three measures, but then the Democratic House would have its way. The conference committees reported that all matters of detail could be adjusted, but that on these three points no agreement could be reached. The Democratic conferrees on the part of the House were determined, to quote the language of Senator Beck of Kentucky, "that, unless these rights were secured to the people in the bill sent to the Senate, they would refuse, under their constitutional right, to make appropriations to carry on the Government, if the dominant majority in the Senate insisted upon the maintenance of those laws, and refused to consent to their repeal." This Senator went further, and declared:

If, however, the President of the United States, in the exercise of the power vested in him, should see fit to veto the bills thus presented to him, . . . then I have no doubt those same amendments will be again made part of the appropriation bills, and it will be for the President to determine whether he will block the wheels of government, and refuse to accept necessary appropriations, rather than allow the representatives of the people to repeal the odious laws which they regard as subversive of their rights and privileges. . . . Whether that course is right or wrong, it will be adopted, and I have no doubt adhered to, no matter what happens with the appropriation bills.

The Democrats sought to base their refusal to vote the appropriations until their demands were complied with on high constitutional and historical ground. Said Senator Thurman:

We claim the right, which the House of Commons in England established after two centuries of contest, to say that we will not grant the money of the people unless there is a redress of grievances.

Neither the Senate nor the House would yield, and so the Forty-fifth Congress adjourned, leaving forty-five million dollars needed to carry on the Government unappropriated.

The inside history of this Democratic movement has never been divulged. It has been conjectured, however, and many indications seem to point to the conclusion, that it was in the interest of a certain Democratic aspirant for the Presidency. Since the spring of 1877, the charge of "fraud" had been the Democratic battle-cry. This cry did not rally the hosts so much to the Democratic standard as to the standard of Mr. S. J. Tilden. It was thought, according to the theory under consideration, that a change in the battle-cry might infuse fresh courage into the Democratic hosts, and also rally them to the standard of a different party leader. Hence Senator Thurman's attempt to convince the Democracy and the country that to starve the army and other branches of the public service, unless certain measures of substantive and independent legislation should be incorporated into the appropriation bills, came under the famous English principle established after two centuries of contest: The House of Commons will not vote the money of the people unless the grievances of the people are redressed. But, whatever may have been the party or personal reasons that governed the Democrats in Congress, the position that the party took was extreme, unprecedented in our history, and one that it was ultimately compelled to abandon. So an extra session of Congress became necessary! This began March 18, 1879, and was the first session of the Forty-sixth Congress. The President sent to the Houses a short message, stating the reason why he had called them together—the failure at the regular session to provide for the Army and the Legislative, Judicial, and Executive Departments of the Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1879. The Democrats now controlled the Senate as well as the House;

and they were confident of their ability to pass the bills in such shape as should suit them, and to compel the President, by withholding the appropriations if he would not otherwise yield, to sign them. March 27th an Army bill was reported in the House. This bill did not contain the clauses pertaining to the reorganization of the army found in the House bill of the previous session, but it did contain these objectionable features:

SECTION 6. That section 2002 of the Revised Statutes be amended so as to read as follows: "No military or naval officer, or other person engaged in the civil, military, or naval service of the United States, shall order, bring, keep, or have under his authority or control, any troops or armed men at the place where any general or special election is held in any State, unless it be necessary to repel the armed enemies of the United States"; and that section 5528 of the Revised Statutes be amended so as to read as follows: "Every officer of the army or navy, or other person in the civil, military, or naval service of the United States, who orders, brings, keeps, or has under his authority or control, any troops or armed men at any place where a general or special election is held in any State, unless such force be necessary to repel armed enemies of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$5,000, and suffer imprisonment at hard labor not less than three months nor more than five years."

The history of the struggle on this bill need not be followed point by point. It was the manifest purpose of the Democrats to wage an offensive war. Their purpose was to raise the cry of "Troops at the Polls," as for two years they had cried "Fraud in the Election," and to throw the Republicans on the defensive. There was a two days' debate on a point of order; this was decided against the Republicans, and then the battle began. Mr. Garfield had made thorough preparation to speak, but, not expecting the point of order to be disposed of that day, he went up to the Capitol, March 29th, leaving his notes at his house. When the point of order was decided, he suddenly changed his purpose and the whole line of battle as well. He got the floor and delivered his speech, "Revolution in Congress," which, as respects its effects, was the most powerful speech that he has ever made. He began with referring to the gravity and solemnity

of the crisis, stated fully the questions at issue, and then plunged into his argument. He said:

The question, Mr. Chairman, may be asked, Why make any special resistance to the clauses of legislation in this bill, which a good many gentlemen on this side declared at the last session they cared but little about, and regarded as of very little practical importance, because for years there had been no actual use for any part of these laws, and they had no expectation there would be any? It may be asked, Why make any controversy on either side? So far as we are concerned, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say this: We recognize the other side as accomplished parliamentarians and strategists, who have adopted with skill and adroitness their plan of assault. You have placed in the front one of the least objectionable of your measures; but your whole programme has been announced, and we reply to your whole order of battle. The logic of your position compels us to meet you as promptly on the skirmish line as afterward when our intrenchments are assailed; and therefore, at the outset, we plant our case upon the general ground upon which we have chosen to defend it.

He spoke of the distribution of the powers of government under our system: "first, to the Nation; second, to the States; and third, the reservation of power to the people themselves." He pointed out how, if any one of these should fail to exercise its voluntary powers, the whole system would fall into ruins. He said:

Mr. Chairman, viewed from the standpoint of a foreigner, our Government may be said to be the feeblest on the earth. From our standpoint, and with our experience, it is the mightiest. But why would a foreigner call it the feeblest? He can point out a half dozen ways in which it can be destroyed without violence. Of course, all governments may be overturned by the sword; but there are several ways in which our Government may be annihilated without the firing of a gun.

For example, suppose the people of the United States should say, We will elect no Representatives to Congress. Of course, this is a violent supposition; but suppose that they do not: is there any remedy? Does our Constitution provide any remedy whatever? In two years there would be no House of Representatives; of course, no support of the Government, and no Government. Suppose, again, the States should say,

through their Legislatures, We will elect no Senators. Such abstention alone would absolutely destroy this Government; and our system provides no process of compulsion to prevent it.

Again, suppose the two Houses were assembled in their usual order, and a majority of one in this body or in the Senate should firmly band themselves together and say, We will vote to adjourn the moment the hour of meeting arrives, and continue so to vote at every session during our two years of existence. The Government would perish, and there is no provision of the Constitution to prevent it. Or, again, if a majority of one of either body should declare that they would vote down, and did vote down, every bill to support the Government by appropriations, can you find in the whole range of our judicial or our executive authority any remedy whatever? A Senator or a member of this House is free, and may vote "no" on every proposition. Nothing but his oath and his honor restrains him. Not so with executive and judicial officers. They have no power to destroy this Government. Let them travel an inch beyond the line of the law, and they fall within the power of impeachment. But against the people who create Representatives, against the Legislatures who create Senators, against Senators and Representatives in these halls, there is no power of impeachment. There is no remedy if, by abstention or by adverse votes, they refuse to support the Government.

He then argued the proposition that free consent is the basis of our laws.

Our theory of law is free consent. That is the granite foundation of our whole superstructure. Nothing in the Republic can be law without consent—the free consent of the House; the free consent of the Senate; the free consent of the Executive, or, if he refuse it, the free consent of two thirds of these bodies. Will any man deny that? Will any man challenge a line of the statement that free consent is the foundation rock of all our institutions? And yet the programme announced two weeks ago was that, if the Senate refused to consent to the demand of the House, the Government should stop. And the proposition was then, and the programme is now, that, although there is not a Senate to be coerced, there is still a third independent branch in the legislative power of the Government whose consent is to be coerced at the peril of the destruction of this Government; that is, if the President, in the discharge of his duty, shall exercise his plain constitutional right to refuse his consent

to this proposed legislation, the Congress will so use its voluntary powers as to destroy the Government. This is the proposition which we confront; and we denounce it as revolution.

It makes no difference, Mr. Chairman, what the issue is. If it were the simplest and most inoffensive proposition in the world, yet if you demand, as a matter of coercion, that it shall be adopted against the free consent prescribed in the Constitution, every fair-minded man in America is bound to resist you as much as though his own life depended upon his resistance.

Let it be understood that I am not arguing the merits of any one of the three amendments. I am discussing the proposed method of legislation; and I declare that it is against the Constitution of our country. It is revolutionary to the core, and is destructive of the fundamental element of American liberty—the free consent of all the powers that unite to make laws.

In opening this debate, I challenge all comers to show a single instance in our history where this consent has been coerced. This is the great, the paramount issue, which dwarfs all others into insignificance.

Thus it will be seen that his great point was *the method of legislation*. He objected to a political party's carrying their party measures by forcing "riders" on appropriation bills, and refusing to consent to their removal, no matter how obnoxious to the Executive, even if the wants of the Government were not provided for. He went on to show that the laws to be repealed had a Democratic and not a Republican origin. He denounced the Democratic movement as a "New Rebellion," and said that it differed from the old one only in this: The first proposed to *shoot*, the second to *starve*, the Government to death!

This speech carried away the Republican side of the House, electrified the country, and compelled the Democrats to accept battle on ground that they had not chosen. Instead of attacking the Republicans with the legend "No Troops at the Polls" inscribed on their banners, they were now called on to repel the Republicans who were attacking them with the charge of "Revolution." Nearly every Democrat who spoke in the debate felt called upon to answer Garfield; and, without one exception, they misstated his position. So, when he again obtained the floor, April 4th, he pro-

ceeded to set them right, and to state his point with more power than before:

Mr. Chairman: During the last four days, some fifteen or twenty gentlemen have paid their special attention to the argument I made last Saturday, and have announced its complete demolition. Now that the general debate has closed, I will notice the principal points of attack by which this work of destruction has been accomplished.

In the first place, every man, save one, who has replied to me, has alleged that I held it was revolutionary to place this general legislation upon an appropriation bill. One gentleman went so far as to fill a page of the "Record" with citations from the "Congressional Globe" and the "Congressional Record," to show that for many years riders had been placed upon appropriation bills. If gentlemen find any pleasure in setting up a man of straw and knocking it down again, they have enjoyed themselves.

I never claimed that it was either revolutionary or unconstitutional for this House to put a rider on an appropriation bill. No man on this side of the House has claimed that. The most that has been said is that it is considered a bad parliamentary practice; and all parties in this country have said that repeatedly.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Blackburn] evidently thought he was making a telling point against me when he cited the fact that, in 1872, I insisted upon the adoption of a conference report on an appropriation bill that had a rider on it; and he alleged that I said it was revolutionary for his party to resist it. Let me refresh his memory. I said then, and I say now, that it was revolutionary for the minority party to refuse to let the appropriation bill be voted on. For four days they said we should not vote at all on the Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill because there was a rider on it, put there, not by the House, but by the Senate.

I was sorry the rider was put on, and moved to non-concur in the amendments when they came to the House. But when the minority on this floor said that we should not act upon the bill at all, because the rider was put upon it, I said, and now say, it was unjustifiable parliamentary obstruction. We do not filibuster. We do not struggle to prevent a vote on this bill. I will be loyal to the House of which I am a member, and maintain now, as I did then, the right of the majority to bring an appropriation bill to a vote.

You have a right—however unwise and indecent it may be as a matter of parliamentary

practice—you have a perfect right to put this rider on this bill and pass it. When you send it to the Senate, that body has a perfect right to pass it. It is your constitutional right and theirs to pass it; for the free consent of each body is the basis of the law-making power.

When it goes to the President of the United States, it is his constitutional right to approve it; and if he does, it will then be a law, which you and I must obey. But it is equally his constitutional right to disapprove it; and should he do so, then, gentlemen, unless two thirds of this body and two thirds of the Senate pass it, notwithstanding the objections of the President, it is not only not your right to make it a law, but it will be the flattest violation of the Constitution, the sheerest usurpation of power, to attempt to make it a law in any other way. Without these conditions we can not make it a law.

What, then, is the proposition you have offered? You say that there are certain odious laws that you want to take off the statute-book. I say, repeal them, if you can do so constitutionally. But you declare that you will compel consent to your will by refusing the necessary support—not to the President, not to any man, but to the Government itself. This proposition I denounce as revolution, and no man has responded to the charge either by argument or denial.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me add a word in conclusion, lest I may be misunderstood. I said last session, and I have said since, that if you want this whole statute concerning the use of the army at the polls torn from your books, I will help you to do it. If you will offer a naked proposition to repeal those two sections of the Revised Statutes named in the sixth section of this bill, I will vote with you. But you do not ask a repeal of those sections. Why? They impose restrictions upon the use of the army, limiting its functions, and punishing its officers for any infraction of these limitations; but you seek to strike out a negative clause, thereby making new and affirmative legislation of the most sweeping and dangerous character.

Your proposed modification of the law affects not the army alone, but the whole civil power of the United States. "Civil officers" are included in these sections; and if the proposed amendment be adopted, you deny to every civil officer of the United States any power whatever to summon the armed *posse* to help him enforce the processes of the law. If you pass the section in that form, you impose restrictions upon the civil authorities of the United States never

before proposed in any Congress by any legislator since this Government began. I say, therefore, in the shape you propose this, it is much the worst of all your "riders." In the beginning of this contest we understood that you desired only to get the army away from the polls. As that would still leave the civil officers full power to keep the peace at the polls, I thought it was the least important and the least dangerous of your demands; but, as you have put it here, it is the most dangerous. If you reenact it in the shape presented, it becomes a later law than the Supervisors and Marshals Law, and *pro tanto* repeals the latter. As it stands now in the statute-book, it is the earlier statute, and is *pro tanto* itself repealed by the Marshals Law of 1871, and is, therefore, harmless so far as it relates to civil officers. But, if you put it in here, you deny the power of the Marshals of the United States to perform their duties whenever a riot may require the use of an armed *posse*.

Though easily carrying the bill through the Houses, rider and all, the Democrats encountered the President's veto. What is more, they encountered the opposition of the majority of the people. With great unanimity the intelligence, sobriety, and conservatism of the country were aroused against them. In no long time they discovered that they had made a mistake; that the people could not be rallied to the cry, "No Troops at the Polls"; and that they must make their retreat in the best way they could. Their line of retreat need not be followed step by step. June 6th another bill, making appropriations for the army, was reported. This bill promptly passed and became a law. The objectionable features were omitted, but this clause was inserted:

That no money appropriated in this Act is appropriated or shall be paid for the subsistence, equipment, transportation, or compensation of any portion of the army of the United States to be used as a police force to keep the peace at the polls, at any election held within any State.

Good lawyers said, however, that this stump speech inserted in the bill was of no force whatever; while Republican politicians said it was put in only to keep up appearances.

The bill for the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Departments of the Government

has a similar history. After much delay and loud threatening, all the money required for these purposes was voted except \$600,000 needed to pay the Marshals. So of the \$45,000,000 that the Democrats never would vote unless there was a "redress of grievances," only this small sum remained unappropriated at the close of the long campaign! From any point of view, the Democrats could not regard the struggle with other than painful feelings; while the Republicans congratulated themselves on having rendered the country a substantial service, and on having beaten their opponents in a political battle. No man in either House, on the Republican side, was so prominent in all stages of the conflict as Mr. Garfield. To no other man were the Republicans so much indebted for their victory. It must be admitted that his plan of campaign was a bold one, and might have been most disastrous. This he pointed out in his speech on the Legislative Bill, April 26th:

Gentlemen: I took upon myself a very grave responsibility in the opening of this debate when I quoted the declarations of leading members on the other side, and said that the programme was revolution, and, if not abandoned, would result in the destruction of this Government. I declared that you had entered upon a scheme which, if persisted in, would starve the Government to death. I say that I took a great risk when I made this charge against you as a party. I put myself in your power, gentlemen. If I had misconceived your purposes and misrepresented your motives, it was in your power to prove me a false accuser. It was in your power to ruin me in the estimation of fair-minded, patriotic men by the utterance of one sentence. The humblest or the greatest of you could have overwhelmed me with shame and confusion in one short sentence. You could have said: "We wish to pass our measures of legislation in reference to elections, juries, and the use of the army; and we will, if we can do so constitutionally; but if we can not get these measures in accordance with the Constitution, we will pass the appropriation bills like loyal representatives, and then go home and appeal to the people."

If any man, speaking for the majority, had made that declaration, uttered that sentence, he would have ruined me in the estimation of fair-minded men, and set me down as a false accuser and slanderer. Forty-five of you have spoken; forty-five of you have deluged the ear of this

country with debate; but that sentence has not been spoken by any one of you. On the contrary, by your silence, as well as by your affirmation, you have made my accusation overwhelmingly true

And there I leave that controversy. The assaults upon my speech have been, from the beginning to the end, evasions of the issue. What have you said? Not less than thirty of you, in spite of my plain and emphatic declarations to the contrary, have insisted that I said it was revolutionary to put a rider on an appropriation bill, a thing that no man on this side of the House has said. You were guilty, gentlemen, of what Sydney Smith once called "an indecent exposure of your intellects."

Mr. Garfield's speeches at this extra session, long and short, fill a pamphlet of fifty-four pages. In no other equal period of time has he put forth an equal degree of mental power; and in no other session of Congress has he exerted so great an influence. Besides those on the two bills, he made the following speeches: "Defense of Union Soldiers of the Seceded States," "Resumption and the Currency," "The New Silver Bill," "The Mississippi River an Object of National Care," "The Revived Doctrine of State Rights."

As we have seen, the special session came to an end July 1st, without any provision being made for the payment of the United States marshals. From that day, which was the beginning of the new fiscal year, these officers were compelled not only to get on without their own pay, but also to pay out of their own pockets all the expenses of their offices. This they did, in the hope that when Congress again sat the appropriation would be voted. The public business was much deranged, and the marshals subjected to no small inconvenience and expense. When the business came up again, at the regular session, in the winter of 1879-'80, a leading Democrat and member of the Appropriations Committee declared that this \$600,000 never would be voted until his party had their way. The threat was idle. Democratic members of Congress, as a whole, saw that they had fought a losing battle from the beginning; so the whole amount was voted, less \$7,400 that properly belonged to certain marshals for services rendered at

elections. This small remnant of the \$45,000 still stands to the account of grievances unredressed!

But Congress at this session had to deal with another question: What shall be done for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1880? The answer can be quickly given. The Army appropriation was promptly voted; so were the appropriations for the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Departments of the Government, with this exception: no provision whatever was made for the services of marshals at elections; in all other respects the marshals were fully provided for. Nothing more need be said about these fiercely contested questions, except to define General Garfield's relations to the appointment of the marshals. Without following the crooks and turns of parliamentary practice, it may be said that, March 19th, he avowed himself in favor of this proposition:

That all appointments of said special deputy marshals having any duty to perform in respect to any election shall be made by the Judge of the Circuit Court of the United States for the district in which such marshals are to perform their duties, or by the District Judge in the absence of the Circuit Judge.

The main point here involved was, whether these deputies should be appointed by the marshals, as the existing law said, or by the judges, as he proposed. He was willing at any time to vote for his proposition as an original measure, standing by itself; but he declined to vote for it as a rider, and voted against it when it was insisted on as such. His proposition to vest the appointment of these marshals in the judges was opposed by the majority of his party in the House, and by all the Republican Senators save one. April 24th he defined his position in a brief speech, which is here given at length:

Nothing is more unfortunate than the persistent determination of a majority of this House to tack "riders" upon appropriation bills, and thus take again the indefensible position of last session, that they will coerce another branch of the Government to approve of an independent measure in order to save the Government supplies. There is no valid reason for not offering this amendment and passing it through both Houses as an independent bill. The majority have the

power to pass it, and, if it is made free from ambiguity, I have no doubt it would receive many votes on this side. But the majority have adopted a method to reach the result which is universally acknowledged to be bad, and which they know is especially offensive to the minority. On this ground we are unanimous on this side of the House in the opinion that this amendment ought not to be made to this bill.

In short, to put this measure upon this bill is a challenge to an independent department of the Government—the Executive—to declare whether he will consent to be coerced in order to secure the necessary appropriations. It is a revival of the controversy of the last session that ended so disastrously to the majority. Experience ought to have taught them wisdom and led them to offer this measure by itself.

I now ask attention to the merits of the proposition itself. If the point made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Reed] be good, that the language of this amendment is such that its provisions can not be fairly and fully executed, his objection is fatal to the measure. In my judgment, however, the pending clause, by necessary implication, is a repeal of a part of one of the sections of the election laws, and hence must be incorporated with that section, and be construed and executed as a part of the whole body of the election laws; and I think any court would be compelled to construe it as a part of these laws. Still, if there is a reasonable doubt on that question, it is a good reason why that doubt ought to be removed before the amendment becomes a law.

Now, I call attention to the debate on another point. In all that has been said about it, I have noticed what appears to me an utter ignoring of one central fact in relation to the special deputy marshals created by the election law. They are a class of officers wholly unknown to the statutes of the United States, except as they appear in the election law. Marshals and deputy marshals have been known in our statutes since 1789, and their powers and duties have been carefully defined; but the office of special deputy marshal never existed in this country until it was created, and its duties defined, in the sections of the election law of 1871.

To show how completely this office has been confounded in the recent debate with that of deputy marshal, or general deputy marshal as it is called by way of distinction in the statutes, I call attention to section 2021, and the sections immediately following. The duty of the special deputy marshal is to attend all places of registra-

tion and voting for members of Congress, and "to aid and assist the supervisors of election in the verification of any list of persons who may have registered or voted." This is the primary and chief duty of special deputy marshals. They are really assistants of the supervisors, rather than [of] the marshals; and the fact that they are called special deputy marshals does not change the nature of their office or the character of their duties.

It is true that in the next section (2022) these officers are made conservators of the peace; but so are the supervisors of the elections and many other officers. But with this exception the special deputy marshals have none of the general executive powers which the law has confided to marshals and their general deputies. They have no authority by virtue of their appointment as special deputies to make arrests and summon the *posse comitatus* to put down violence at the election. This they can do only when the marshal, under his hand and seal in writing, specially empowers them so to act, as provided in section 2024. But the general deputy marshals are required to exercise these powers by virtue of the office they hold as defined by the law. From this review of the statutes it will be seen that the chief duty of the special deputy marshals is to accompany and assist the supervisors of the election in the discharge of their *quasi* judicial duties; that is, in scrutinizing and verifying the registration and election, and detecting any fraud, or attempted fraud.

Let me follow this subject a step further. The supervisor can not leave his post at the ballot-box to follow John Doe and learn whether he has registered or voted under a false name; and, therefore, this section of the statute (2021) gives the supervisor an assistant, known as a special deputy marshal, who goes out and verifies John Doe, and reports the result of his investigation to the supervisor. As this is their chief function, it is clear that the special deputy marshals, in their essential character, are assistant supervisors, and their duties partake of the judicial character of those of their chief.

Under the law as it now stands, the supervisors themselves are appointed by the courts, and from the different political parties. Now, can any valid reason be given on the merits of the case why their assistants, whose first and chief duty is to aid them in the discharge of their *quasi* judicial duties, should not also be appointed by the court, as they themselves are appointed, without regard to political affiliation? The argument that these officers should not be appointed by the

court because they are under the orders of the marshal, falls to the ground when the plain fact is known that they serve the supervisor rather than the marshal. But we are told that if the special deputies should be appointed from different political parties there would be no unity of action among them in the execution of the law. I am not willing to confess, for I do not believe it to be true, that this country is so far gone into debasement and anarchy that the fair-minded people in any Democratic township or ward can truthfully say, "There is no Republican in this precinct who can be trusted to aid in executing the election law," or that they will in any Republican community say, "There is no Democrat in all the borders of this district whom we can trust to help carry out a fair election law." When I am compelled to believe this, I shall say that my country is no longer capable of self-government, is no longer worthy of freedom.

Our laws provide for summoning the *posse comitatus* as the extreme civil remedy for suppressing disorder and keeping the peace. What is the *posse comitatus* but the whole body of bystanders—men of all political parties? The theory of our Government is that in the last civil resort we summon all men, without distinction of party, to act as conservators of the peace. If the bystanders, without distinction of party, can be trusted to perform this important duty, surely we can trust such as the court, on its high responsibility, shall appoint to aid in securing a fair election. It ought constantly to be remembered that no one of these special deputy marshals has any power to put down a riot at the polls, unless the marshal, under his hand and seal, in writing, shall specially empower such special deputy to do that thing; and let it also be remembered that this amendment in no way interferes with the power of the marshal to appoint as many general deputy marshals as may be needed to suppress disorder.

I hope I am not altogether a dreamer, forgetful of practical necessities, but I have never been able to see why this measure can not be executed fully, thoroughly, and justly, provided its language makes it a part of the election law. My friend from Maine [Mr. Reed] has raised some doubt on that point, and in so far as that doubt is justified, it is a fair argument against the clause. But we should look beyond the mere word of the amendment to the objects of national good it may be made to accomplish. I care but little for it as a mere settlement of a present party controversy.

No thoughtful man can fail to see great danger in a close and bitterly contested national elec-

tion. In common with my party associates, I believe that these election laws are great and beneficent safeguards to the fair and free expression of the national will. Now, if the adoption of a measure like this will harness the two great political parties to these election laws, by the bonds of common consent and mutual coöperation for their enforcement, it will be a benefit that will far outweigh any slight advantage that can be gained by retaining wholly within our party the appointment of a few officers to aid the supervisors. I believe this measure will not weaken but will strengthen the authority of the election laws, and will remove from them the only reasonable ground of complaint that the other side have made against them.

I resist the amendment only because it is a rider which should not be a part of the Appropriation bill; but as a measure by itself, clearly and plainly drawn, I will cordially support it. I agree that ours is a party Government, and I believe in parties, especially my own; but when we come to the ballot-box, where citizens of all parties meet to enjoy the highest rights of freemen, all parties should unite in enforcing these just and necessary laws, designed to secure free, fair, and peaceable national elections throughout the Union.

I now withdraw my formal amendment.

While the bill to pay the marshals for the year ending June 30, 1880, was pending in the House, Mr. Garfield made a vigorous speech, March 17th, that he published with the title, "Obedience to the Law the Foremost Duty of Congress." It has since been republished, with the title, "The New Nullification." May 1, 1880, he made a personal explanation in the House, defending himself against the charge that he, by his action in the Committee of Ways and Means, was responsible for the continued high price of paper, caused by the wood-pulp monopoly.

The history of this Congress need not be given at more length. But it was in the regular session, beginning the first Monday of December, 1879, that General Garfield took two long strides in the path of public preferment. The Ohio Legislature, elected the previous October, had to choose a Senator to succeed Mr. Thurman. So far as the Republicans of the State were concerned, the question of the succession did not formally enter into the canvass. At the same time, there was a general expectation that, in case they

were successful, Mr. Garfield would be a leading, if not *the* leading, Senatorial candidate. When the election had passed and the Republicans found that they had carried both Houses by decided majorities, this popular expectation began to solidify into a settled party purpose. Other candidates were spoken of from time to time, but it was clear to the discerning that, if the people had their way, Garfield would be Senator. The popular mind declared itself so strongly that members of the Legislature began to feel that they had no moral choice left them, even if they had other preferences, which most of them had not. No sooner had the Senators and the Representatives come together than all saw that it was a Garfield Legislature. All the various candidates that had been talked about in the newspapers soon discovered that they had no real following, and accordingly withdrew from the contest. Garfield was nominated by acclamation in the party caucus. And the very first day that it could be done under the law, he was elected Senator for the term beginning March 4, 1881, by the unanimous vote of his party. His relations to the canvass and to the election were consistent with the method and spirit of his whole public life. In commenting last winter on his election and what led to it, the author of this Text-Book used the following language :

He has commanded success. His ability, knowledge, mastery of questions, generosity of nature, devotion to the public good, and honesty of purpose, have done the work. He has never had a political "machine." He has never forgotten the day of small things. He has never made personal enemies. It is difficult to see how a political triumph could be more complete or more gratifying than his election to the Senate. No bargains, no "slate," no "grocery" at Columbus. He did not even go to the Capital City. Such things are inspiring to those who think politics in a bad way. He is a man of positive convictions, freely uttered. Politically, he may be called a "man of war"; and yet few men, or none, begrudge him his triumph. Democrats vied with Republicans the other day in Washington in snowing him under with congratulations; some of them were as anxious for his election as any Republican could be. It is said that he will go to the Senate without an enemy on either side of the chamber. These things are honorable to

all parties. They show that manhood is more than party.

The second stride was his nomination for the Presidency at Chicago. Only a rapid sketch of this nomination is called for here.

He went to the Republican National Convention as a delegate at large from his State. In a published letter, he had already declared himself in favor of Ohio's presenting to the Convention Secretary Sherman as her choice for the Presidency. He went as a Sherman delegate. His history as a member of the Convention need not be here given point by point. His service as a member of the Committee on Rules; his prompt and efficient participation at each decisive point in the deliberations; his growing power with the Convention and with the whole audience, evinced by the manner in which he was received day by day; his steady loyalty to Mr. Sherman; his great speech putting that gentleman in nomination; his considerate and honorable treatment of all the members of the Convention, and of all the men with whom the Convention dealt; and, finally, his own nomination, June 8th, amid thunders of applause, the roar of artillery, the waving of banners, and the inspiring strains of music—all these were fully spread before the public in the newspapers but yesterday, and I need not recount them. The state of things existing in the Convention on the eve of his nomination is still fresh in men's minds. More than three hundred delegates were avowing a determined purpose to cling to their favorite candidate at all hazards. The four hundred and odd others, constituting a considerable majority of the whole, were divided, apparently hopelessly, among a half dozen candidates, of whom General Garfield was not one. Political and personal differences had gone so far that wise men outside the Convention did not believe that any one of the leading candidates could be nominated. Apparently things had come to a hopeless deadlock. Democrats were looking on with exultation, Republicans with apprehension. It was at this dangerous and exciting moment that James A. Garfield was nominated. Some men said it was a bit of political inspiration; others, that it was an inspiration from a higher power. Which-

ever view we adopt, we can not fail to see that it was a most fortunate nomination, as well for the country as for the Republican party. Its great power was seen, first, in its effect on the Convention itself; second, in the echoes it awoke all over the country; and, third, in the Cincinnati Convention of the Democrats, where, unquestionably, it had much to do with the nomination of General Hancock.

Enough has been said to mark out, in bold lines, Congressman Garfield's great career. The reader is now in a position to weigh and to measure his long and arduous services as a political student, as a member of House committees, as a debater on the floor of Congress, and as a political leader. Some of his minor services to the House, and to the country, will be grouped together and characterized in a few closing paragraphs.

There are times and services in a great legislative body upon which men are brought forward, as much by the occasion itself as by anything else, because of their fitness. These may be called times and services of ceremony and commemoration. To these occasions Mr. Garfield, by his wide culture, appreciative spirit, quick and just discernment of the fitness of things, is well adapted; and on them he has been a frequent and favorite speaker in the House. Three or four of these occasions will be mentioned.

April 14, 1866, he made a brief though felicitous speech on rising to move an adjournment in memory of Abraham Lincoln. He crystallized a great fact or thought in these fit words: "It was no one man who killed Abraham Lincoln; it was the embodied spirit of treason and slavery, inspired with fearful and despairing hate, that struck him down, in the moment of the Nation's supreme joy."

He was the orator, too, chosen by Mrs. Elizabeth Thompson, of New York City, to present to Congress Carpenter's great painting, "Lincoln and Emancipation," which he did in a well-considered speech, February 12, 1878. The House having under consideration a resolution to accept from Massachusetts, in the name of the United States, the statues of John Winthrop and Samuel Adams,

he admirably summed up the services and characters of these two great citizens, December 19, 1876. I can not resist the temptation to quote this passage touching the use to which the old Hall of Representatives is now put, in devoting it to the reception of statues of distinguished citizens and patriots:

As, from time to time, our venerable and beautiful Hall has been peopled with statues of the elect of the States, it has seemed to me that a Third House was being organized within the walls of the Capitol—a house whose members have received their high credentials at the hands of history, and whose term of office will outlast the ages. Year by year we see the circle of its immortal membership enlarging; year by year we see the elect of their country, in eloquent silence, taking their places in this American Pantheon, bringing within its sacred circle the wealth of those immortal memories which made their lives illustrious; and year by year that august assembly is teaching a deeper and grander lesson to all who serve their brief hour in these more ephemeral Houses of Congress. And now two places of great honor have just been most nobly filled.

He participated in the meeting held in commemoration of Dr. S. F. B. Morse, inventor of the telegraph, in the Hall of the House, April 16, 1872. At a similar meeting, held in the same place, in memory of the honored Dr. Joseph Henry, known for his great scientific discoveries and for having been the organizer and head of the Smithsonian Institution, he also bore a distinguished part. Mr. Garfield had been associated for some years with this great man in the regency of the Institution, and he paid a feeling and eloquent tribute to his lamented friend. He has also been a frequent and favorite speaker in the commemorations of deceased Senators and Representatives. His eulogies on Senators Morton and Chandler may be particularly mentioned, and his speech in memory of Hon. Gustave Schleicher, of Texas, will be found in another place.

CHAPTER VII.

THE STUMP, THE BAR, AND THE PLATFORM.

"The most serious and instructive man on the stump."—*G. A. Townsend.*

"He ranks to-day as one of the very best lawyers at the bar of the whole country."—*Stanley Matthews.*

It may seem that such labors as those described in the last chapter would suffice to tax any man's abilities. But over and above performing them, General Garfield has found time and talents to serve the public in other ways. These must now be grouped together and characterized.

His first political efforts were on the stump; the stump has continued to be a theatre of his activity. Since 1864, with the single exception of 1868, when he was in Europe, he has borne a conspicuous and able part in the yearly Ohio canvasses. Years ago, the State Central Committee stated that there were twice as many calls through the State for "a speech from Mr. Garfield" as from any other speaker. Nor have his speeches on the hustings been confined to Ohio. He has taken a part in canvassing Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri. In most of these States he has been heard in repeated canvasses. A week or two's help from him was, at one time, thought almost essential to carrying some of the New England elections. Mr. G. A. Townsend says, "He is the most serious and instructive man on the stump." This is the exact truth. His conception of what stump oratory should be is the highest, and he comes as near realizing it as any of his competitors. He does not look upon the stump as an engine for amusing the people, or for arousing them to unintelligent action. He rather regards it as a great political educator of the people. His speeches are full of facts, well reasoned, happily illustrated, pure in diction as in sentiment, alive with patriotism, and are sent home to men's minds with the vital power of his own heart. He recognizes the difference between popular and forensic oratory; but, while making his public speeches popular in the best sense, he never forgets the

dignity of the statesman. His speeches are marked by a fairness, candor, and integrity that give his utterances weight with men of all parties. They may dissent from his conclusions, but they can not fail to respect the mental and moral qualities of the man. It may be said of him, adapting the words that Mr. Whipple used of Daniel Webster, that he long ago succeeded in domesticating himself at thousands of American firesides. Some of his great popular efforts—as those made in Cleveland, October 11, 1879, Faneuil Hall, September 10, 1878, and Madison, Wisconsin, July 23, 1879—may be recommended to stump orators as models. The key to his stump oratory is found in the dignity of his own mind, and in his lofty estimate of the American people. Realizing fully that the masses are often unjust and passionate, he still has great faith in their sober second thought. Accordingly he never trifles with the popular mind. He believes that it is entitled to the best that is to be known. He is willing to trust it with the truth, believing that, in the end, wisdom will be justified of her children. The eloquent words in which, at Chicago, he spoke of the popular intelligence as the sea-level from which the politician must make his measurements, will not soon be forgotten. On repeated occasions he has spoken to his own constituency of the confidence and strength that he drew from their support. It may be said that the relations between him and that constituency, for eighteen years, have come as near to the ideal as can fairly be expected in the existing state of our civilization. Some of these relations were thus touched two years ago in the correspondence of the "Cleveland Herald":

WARREN, August 20, 1878.

A Republican Convention in the Nineteenth Ohio District came long since to be a stereotyped affair. The delegates come together, shake hands all round, find they are all of one mind, renominate General Garfield by acclamation, pass a few sound Republican resolutions, listen to a short speech from their Representative, shake hands again, and go home. While waiting for the Convention to assemble in the morning, or for the trains to leave after it has adjourned in the afternoon, there is a free comparison of views among the leading politicians as to the condition of the party, and the majorities it will probably get out

in the several counties; but no one as much as suggests a rival candidate. Garfield goes about among the delegates with the easy air of an old friend, and they treat him as if he were a big brother come home again. He knows them all by name, and calls some of them by their first names, and not a few of them hail him affectionately as "James." When he talks about politics they listen as to an oracle; but they evidently regard the oracle as a household divinity, of whom there is no occasion to stand in awe. They look upon him as thoroughly in sympathy with their views and interests—one of themselves—a man of the people, who has climbed high up on the political ladder without once forgetting his obligations to the men who put him on the first rounds, or losing an interest in the every-day affairs of the people who have so often given him their votes.

Presumably, in the beginning of 1861, Mr. Garfield was looking to the bar as the sphere of his life-work. I have already mentioned that he was admitted to practice in that winter. If this conjecture be right, then it must be said that war first, and politics afterward, frustrated his expectations. Still, he is a lawyer. However, his political life is so overshadowing that few men know how able a lawyer he is. His first appearance as counsel was in the Supreme Court of the United States. Can the same be said of another lawyer in the country? This was in 1866. Since then he has been engaged in some thirty cases before the same great tribunal, besides numerous appearances in the State courts, and in the inferior tribunals of the United States. Some of these cases have been very difficult as well as important. In managing them, he has been more than ordinarily successful. With a single exception, the lustory and merits of these cases can not be pointed out. Nor would a list of their titles convey any clear ideas to the lay mind.

It will probably seem strange to many that a man who had never been brought up in a law-office, or trained in the courts, should be capable of handling great legal interests. A half dozen of his law arguments and briefs lie before me as I write, and an examination of these will solve, even to an intelligent layman, the problem. Law is partly an ethical and partly an historical science. The great principles of right and

justice that lie at the basis of jurisprudence are comparatively few and simple. The business of an advocate of a high order is to apply these principles, resting on the facts of human nature and developed in history, to those varying and often conflicting affairs in human life that become subjects of litigation. Successfully to do this requires abilities of a high order, and a severe logical training. When he entered the Supreme Court room, in 1866, Mr. Garfield had both the abilities and the training needed. He had mastered the great doctrines of the law. History had taught him the direction in which juridical and political thought had been moving, as respected the case in hand. In fact, it was a politico-legal case. For the rest, he had simply to hunt up the decisions of the courts in like or in analogous cases, which, to a practiced student like him, was a work of no great difficulty. Teaching, politics, war, and jurisprudence are very different kinds of activity; but the qualities that have made him great in one are, for the most part, those that have made him great in all. His life teaches the young American how a man of native abilities, thorough general training, and resolute purpose can successfully engage in different fields of human employment. Those who have carefully read Mr. Garfield's speeches in the House for the last seventeen years have noticed that he has not been at a disadvantage in discussing purely legal questions, even when matched against trained lawyers. Such men were probably not surprised to hear so competent an authority as the Hon. Stanley Matthews testify, as he did after the Chicago nomination: "He has qualified himself to be a lawyer, and a good lawyer, as I know; a lawyer who has been called upon to argue many cases in the Supreme Court of the United States; and he ranks to-day as one of the very best lawyers at the bar of the whole country." Before taking up the one case that is to be noticed below, it is proper to add that after Garfield's first argument in the Supreme Court, Hon. J. S. Black strenuously sought to induce him to quit politics and to form a law partnership with himself in Washington, holding out as an inducement an immediate probable professional income of four times a Congressman's

salary per year. Some friends urged compliance with the eminent Judge's overture. For a time Garfield was on the point of yielding; but, fortunately for the country, he finally resolved to serve the public in a political capacity, so long as the public called for his services.

The one case that should receive attention here is known in legal history as "*In the matter of ex-parte L. P. Milligan, W. A. Bowles, and Stephen Horsey.*" In 1864 Milligan, Bowles, and Horsey, citizens of Indiana, were arrested by order of the Major-General commanding the military district of Indiana, and were tried by a military commission sitting in Indianapolis, on the following charges: 1. Conspiracy against the Government of the United States; 2. Affording aid and comfort to rebels against the Government of the United States; 3. Inciting insurrection; 4. Disloyal practices; 5. Violations against the laws of war. The accused pleaded that the military commission had no jurisdiction over them. Overruling this plea, the Court proceeded to try them, found them guilty, and they were condemned to death by hanging. This sentence was commuted by the President to imprisonment for life. The prisoners now filed a petition in the Circuit Court of the United States for Indiana, praying for release at the hands of the Court. The opinions of the judges were divided, and the case was certified to the Supreme Court at Washington. The questions so certified were the following:

1. On the facts stated in said petition and exhibits, ought a writ of *habeas corpus* to be issued according to the prayer of said petition? 2. On the facts stated in said petition and exhibits, ought the petitioners to be discharged from custody, as in said petition prayed? 3. Whether, upon the facts stated in said petition and exhibits, the military commission mentioned therein had jurisdiction legally to try and sentence said petitioners in manner and form as in said petition and exhibits is stated?

In March, 1866, the case was argued by very able counsel: Hon. J. E. McDonald, Hon. J. A. Garfield, Hon. J. S. Black, and Hon. D. D. Field for the petitioners; Hon. B. F. Butler, Hon. James Speed, and Hon. Henry Stanbury for the United States. Mr. Garfield's argument was a very able one;

the conclusions reached will be given in another place. Here it suffices to say, that the question at issue was whether, under the Constitution and laws of the United States, citizens living in parts not affected by war or rebellion could be tried by military courts? He argued that only the civil courts have jurisdiction in such cases. The peroration of his speech may well be quoted in this place:

When Pericles had made Greece immortal in arts and arms, in liberty and law, he invoked the genius of Phidias to devise a monument which should symbolize the beauty and glory of Athens. That artist selected for his theme the tutelary divinity of Athens, the Jove-born Goddess, protectress of arts and arms, of industry and law, who typified the Greek conception of composed, majestic, unrelenting force. He erected on the heights of the Acropolis a colossal statue of Minerva, armed with spear and helmet, which towered in awful majesty above the surrounding temples of the gods. Sailors on far-off ships beheld the crest and spear of the Goddess, and bowed with reverent awe. To every Greek she was the symbol of power and glory. But the Acropolis, with its temples and statues, is now a heap of ruins. The visible gods have vanished in the clearer light of modern civilization. We can not restore the decayed emblems of ancient Greece, but it is in your power, O Judges, to erect in this citadel of our liberties a monument more lasting than brass; invisible, indeed, to the eye of flesh, but visible to the eye of the spirit as the awful form and figure of Justice crowning and adorning the Republic; rising above the storms of political strife, above the din of battle, above the earthquake shock of rebellion; seen from afar and hailed as protector by the oppressed of all nations; dispensing equal blessings, and covering with the protecting shield of law the weakest, the humblest, the meanest, and, until declared by solemn law unworthy of protection, the guiltiest of its citizens.

The Court decided in favor of the petitioners, and they were released. General Garfield was subjected to considerable criticism for his speech on this case. Union sentiment was running strong, and some Unionists seemed to think that rebels, and those who gave aid and comfort to rebellion, should be punished, it mattered not how. In a speech delivered in Warren, Ohio, some time after, he defended his course.

He reminded his hearers that the question which he had argued was not whether Milligan, Bowles, and Horsey were innocent or guilty, but whether they had been legally tried and condemned. He had no sympathy with them as conspirators, but as men asking for legal rights he could properly give them professional assistance. "If guilty," he said, "hang them, but hang them according to law, if you do it otherwise, you commit murder." The matter has long since passed out of the public mind, but this short history is in place here, as showing Mr. Garfield's opposition to all violent and non-legal methods of administering justice. For him, a radical Republican, representing one of the most radical of constituencies, to consent to act in such a case, in the excited state of public feeling, was no small proof both of justice and of courage.

Mr. Garfield has been a generous respondent to the calls so freely made by the public upon public men for those miscellaneous services that are so hard to characterize in brief terms. His speeches and addresses on ceremonial, commemorative, and other public occasions, great and small, can not be numbered. A few of these efforts will receive brief mention here.

At the Hiram Commencement in 1867 he delivered an elaborate address on "College Education." The old Eclectic Institute was now donning college dignities, and the subject and the speaker could not otherwise have been so well chosen. He ran over the history of higher education; drew copiously from his stores of literary information; criticised the old classical college course as not meeting the wants of the time; and introduced the new College to the "New Education." Two years later he delivered an address to the Consolidated Business College of Washington, D. C., on "The Elements of Success." This address abounded in rich practical facts and thoughts, and had for its motto this saying of George Canning's: "My road must be through character to power. I will try no other course, and I am sanguine enough to believe that this course, though, perhaps, not the quickest, is the surest." His remarks on the Ninth Census, made in the House in the spring of 1869, attracted the attention of the Social Science Associa-

tion managers. These saw at once that a politician had now approached the Census in the spirit of science. He was immediately invited to prepare a paper on the subject for the next meeting of the Association, an invitation to which he responded in "The American Census," a most valuable paper, read in New York in October following. At the Fourth Annual Reunion of the Army of the Cumberland, held in Cleveland in the autumn of 1870, he delivered a masterly oration on the life and character of General George H. Thomas. Again we find him in Hiram on Commencement Day. In the college year 1874-'75, his old fellow pupil, fellow teacher, and faithful monitor and friend of many years, Miss Almeda A. Booth, died in Cleveland. She had not been connected with the Hiram Institute, save in memory, for several years; but, as she was so long identified with its interests in by-gone years, and so many of her old pupils would be sure to attend the annual commencement, the authorities deemed it fitting that her great life and services should be commemorated. No one could discharge this duty but Mr. Garfield. His address on the life and character of this noble woman was most truthful, appreciative, and eloquent. Surely an old Hiram student may be pardoned if he call it the best of its author's similar efforts. In an address entitled "The Future of the Republic; its Dangers and its Hopes," delivered before the literary societies of Western Reserve College, Hudson, Ohio, in 1873, he ably discussed a number of questions of great public interest—principally the dangers of universal suffrage and industrial corporations. Under the first head he replied to the strictures of Lord Macaulay upon our political system; and under the second discussed the perplexing problems presented to modern society by the enormous growth of the railway system. He is also the author of an address delivered before the Historical Society of Burton, Geauga County, Ohio, on "The Discovery and Settlement of the Northwest." This address called out a hearty encomium from the historian Parkman.

He has also found time to contribute to our higher periodical literature. "The Atlantic Monthly" contains two articles from

his pen: "The Currency Conflict," February, 1876; and "A Century of Congress," July, 1877. Four papers from him are found in the "North American Review": "The Army of the United States, Part I," March-April, 1878; "The Army of the United States, Part II," May-June, the same year; "Ought the Negro to be Disfranchised?"—one of a group of articles called a Symposium—March, 1879; and "National Appropriations and Misappropriations," June, 1879. He also contributed a chapter to the Japanese Minister's, Arinori Mori's, book on education. He wrote also the introduction to the English translation of the Marquis de Chambrun's book on "Executive Power in the United States." All of these contributions to current literature are of substantial value.

With a glance at General Garfield's inner intellectual life this chapter will close. Since he entered Congress seventeen years have passed, and they have been to him years of remarkable mental growth in all directions. We notice here what the inductive philosophers call the "mutuality of cause and effect." His public duties have compelled him to keep up and extend his private studies; his private studies have greatly enlarged the sphere of his public duties. His zest for the delights and amenities of literature and scholarship have grown with his growth and strengthened with his strength. The number of topics yet to be touched in this sketch admonishes me not to linger long on this spot, green and delightful as such a spot ever is in a man of great public affairs. Not unfrequently he finds time, in the lulls between political storms, or in the very roar of the tempest, to gather materials for a "study" of some literary topic. Were he a less busy man, these materials would find their way to the public through review and quarterly pages. As it is, he often finds expression for what he is unwilling to keep all to himself in a long letter to some friend, who is sure to lay the letter away among his valuables. As an example, I shall here append one of these letters, kindly furnished me by the gentleman to whom it was addressed. If some classical scholar, chancing to read this sketch, should grow weary of politics, he will surely find

his interest revive as he runs over these paragraphs:

WASHINGTON, D C., December 16, 1871.

DEAR PROFESSOR: Before I am wholly overwhelmed with the very arduous and long-continued work which this winter's session will impose upon me, I will take the time to write you a long, and I hope not an uninteresting, letter on a subject to which I have given some attention, from time to time, during the last few years.

Since I entered public life, I have constantly aimed to find a little time to keep alive the spirit of my classical studies, and to resist that constant tendency, which all public men feel, to grow rusty in literary studies, and particularly in the classical studies. I have thought it better to select some one line of classical reading, and, if possible, do a little work on it each day. For this winter, I am determined to review such parts of the Odes of Horace as I may be able to reach. And, as preliminary to that work, I have begun by reading up the bibliography of Horace.

The Congressional Library is very rich in materials for this study, and I am amazed to find how deep and universal has been the impress left on the cultivated mind of the world by Horace's writings.

In a French volume before me, entitled "Édition Polyglotte," M. Monfalcon, Paris, 1834, in which the Latin text and translations into Spanish, Italian, French, English, and German are given, I find a catalogue of the editions of Horace published in each year from the date of the invention of printing down to 1833. This remarkable catalogue of editions fills seventy quarto columns of Monfalcon's book. Besides this Polyglot edition, there are lying on my table, for reference, two thick volumes made up wholly of comments on Horace (the body of the text being wholly omitted), by Lambin, a great French scholar, who lived two hundred years ago; also two thick volumes by Orelli, the Swiss scholar, who died in 1850; also three volumes of the Delphin Horace, edited by Valpy, the English scholar. These form but a small part of the stores of Horatian literature which our library contains; but these facts refer rather to the bibliography of Horace, and are aside from the particular point I have in view in this letter.

I have observed, in looking over the works on Horace, that a line of thought has been pursued by scholars and antiquarians quite analogous to that pursued by scientific men in forecasting—I might almost say discovering—facts by induction from general principles. Let me illustrate this.

You remember the familiar illustration of it in the case of Leverrier, who found a perturbation in the movements of some of the planets of the solar system, and, after having established the character and extent of that perturbation, declared that there must be an unknown planet of a certain size in a certain quarter of the heavens, whose presence would account for the perturbation; and finally, by pointing the telescope to that quarter of the heavens, the predicted planet was found.

A recent fact may afford a still further instructive illustration of the same principle. Two weeks ago to-day, Professor Agassiz, on the eve of departure for South America on a voyage of scientific discovery, addressed a letter to Professor Peirce of the United States Coast Survey, in which he predicts with great particularity what classes of marine animals he expects to find in the deep-sea soundings of the southern hemisphere; what disposition of bowlders, the character and direction of glacial groovings, he expects to find in the southern continent. The Professor has so fully committed himself that the result of the expedition must be a great triumph or a great failure for him.

Now, quite analogous to these researches in the field of science has been the process by which scholars have discovered the long-lost location of the country residence of Horace. Its site, and almost its existence, were forgotten during the centuries of darkness which the Middle Ages brought upon Europe; and it was only after the revival of learning that men began to inquire for the old shrines and homes of the ancient Greeks and Romans. For a long time the site of the country home of Horace was merely a matter of conjecture, and scores of theories were advanced in regard to it. I have now before me the work which was, I believe, the first thorough and elaborate attempt to apply the scientific process to the discovery of the site of the villa of Horace. It is in three volumes, of about five hundred pages each, and was written at Rome in 1766-'67 by the Abbé Bertrand Capmartin de Chaupy, a French ecclesiastic, who about that time spent several years in Rome, and subsequently, at the time of the French Revolution, fled to Italy, partly for safety and partly to gratify his love of classical study.

I have run hastily over these volumes, and will give you a brief statement of the scope and character of the argument. The first volume lays down the method by which we should proceed in finding the location of the Horatian villa. In following out this method, he brings together all the

references made to it, directly or indirectly, in the works of Horace, and many other similar references from many other contemporary authorities and authors of the next succeeding period. From these elements he sets forth in general terms the features that any proposed site must possess in order to be trusted as the real place.

In his second volume he applies the results of the first volume to all the localities that have been proposed as the site, and reaches the conclusion that none of them will stand the test.

In the third volume he traces the history of the changes that swept over the country in the neighborhood of Rome, the devastations and rebuildings, the decays and reconstructions of cities and villas, and finally directs all his tests to one point, which he affirms, *a priori*, must be the very location.

This investigation leads him to the conclusion that the country home of Horace was situated among the Sabine Mountains, a few miles above Tivoli, upon the little river Digence, between the mountains Lucretile and Ustica on one side and the village of Mantella on the other, and not far from Varia, which was a little village on the Anio, and is now the hamlet of Vario.

Such were the conclusions drawn by the Abbé from his elaborate investigation. Subsequent explorations have, I believe, in the main confirmed the correctness of his conclusions.

In a London edition of Horace, of 1849, by the Rev. Henry Hart Milman, there is printed a letter by G. Dennis, written, as its author believes, near the very spot where Horace wrote most of his odes. The letter is a most charming one, full of enthusiasm for the poet and his works, and gives a delightful description of the country and its surroundings.

Did I not know that I lack the time and you the patience, I should be tempted to send the whole letter; but, when you visit us in Washington, as I hope you will do some time, you must not fail to read it. I hope I may not have distressed you with the length of this letter.

My children are nearly recovered from scarlet fever. All the family are now well, and join me in kindest regards to Mrs. Demmon and yourself.

Very truly yours,
J. A. GARFIELD.

Professor I. N. DEMMON, *Hiram,*
Portage County, Ohio.

Mr. Demmon, formerly of Hiram College, Ohio, now of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, contributes the following delightful letter to my pages:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, }
ANN ARBOR, July 9, 1880 }

MY DEAR HINSDALE In regard to General Garfield's scholarship, it seems to me that a paragraph in your speech of June 19th sums up the matter admirably. I do not see how your statement of the case can be improved upon.

During my two years as Professor of the Ancient Languages at Hiram, I had the honor of frequent conversations with the General, and naturally the conversation sometimes turned on the classics. I was often surprised at his familiarity with these subjects, and particularly at his readiness in quoting from Latin authors. There was no affectation, no straining, no dragging in of classical allusions, so characteristic of the pedant, but a simplicity and spontaneity entirely in consonance with the subject and the occasion. Horace and Virgil, especially the former, seem to have been his favorites among the Latin poets. As I happened to be teaching the Odes of Horace, at his invitation I often exchanged letters with him on difficult or disputed points. These letters are interesting, not only in themselves, but doubly so in showing how, in the midst of great public cares, the statesman could turn aside to the exegesis of a Latin poem. The following will serve as specimens from his letters of this kind.

Under date of January 5, 1872, he writes: "I do not think '*monstra natantia*' of Book I, Ode iii, has reference to ships, but rather to marine monsters. Both the language and the context of the Ode lead me to these conclusions.

"In the third and fourth stanzas the poet is eulogizing the courage of that man who first trusted himself to a ship and to the stormy elements. In the fifth stanza he discusses another feature of that man's courage, namely, that feature which leads him to risk the various phases of death that he might meet by shipwreck at sea. And these were: first, the sea monsters, of which the ancients (in addition to the natural dread that all men feel) had a superstitious dread, as being the inhabitants of the unknown deep; second, the sea dashing around the treacherous rocks and reefs. Both these relate to shipwreck. There would be no immediate fear in beholding huge ships; for, on the sea, they would be rather the hope of life than a '*gradum mortis*.' This view, I find, is confirmed by nearly all the authorities I have consulted.

"Lambin, in his notes, quotes a parallel passage from the Greek of Oppianus, where whales and sharks are monsters of the sea.

"In the Delphin edition of the classics, this

is the ordo: '*Quod mortis genus formidavit qui sine lacrymis asperit putes monstruosos nantes?*' In his notes, the Delphin editor says: '*Monstra natantia, cete grandia et immania*. Conf. Juvenal, Sat. xiv, 283, *Oceani monstra*.'

"In the Polyglot Edition to which I alluded in my last letter, all the translations, so far as I am able to understand them, give this idea, except one; and one translates '*natantia*' by the word which is equivalent to 'floating,' and which might be applied to a ship.

"The German translation employs the word for swimming, which seems to me the more natural meaning of '*natantia*'."

On January 27, 1872, he wrote as follows: "Thanks for your kind letter of the 23d instant. I am glad to have you keep me in mind of Horace. I do not forget him, but my very heavy work in the House keeps me from giving him as much time as I desire.

"The Ode to which you refer (B. IV, O. vii) is one of the sweetest that Horace ever wrote. It is the sad reflections of a man who has no clear hope of life beyond the grave, who sees in the swift changes of the seasons and years only the certain approach of death, and who braces himself up against the sadness which these reflections bring by the doctrines of the Stoic philosophy. In some of the older editions this motto is placed at the head of the Ode: '*Omnia mutantur tempore; jucunde igitur vivendum est*.'

"I should translate the seventh and eighth verses thus: 'The year admonishes, and the hour which consumes the cherishing day admonishes you not to hope for immortality.'

"Some commentators have supposed that '*Hora*' was used figuratively for '*Dea vicissitudinis*.' Others have supposed that it was a synonym for time in general. Orelli and the better commentators say it means an hour considered as a part of a day, and which Horace says is the destroyer of a day. Lambin paraphrases the passage thus: '*Annus (inquit Horat.) in quo magnae existunt varietates et qui certo dierum numero aliquando clauditur ac terminatur, menses, dies, hora, monent nos ne immortalia speremus*.'

"The day is called *alumnus*,' says Orelli, 'because the sun, which presides over the day, cherishes all things. In this connection see Virg. *Æn.*, v. 64.'

My acquaintance with the General dates, as you may remember, from November, 1868. At your own kind invitation, I spent two days with you at his house on Hiram Hill, and well do I remember those days, and the impression they made on me,

then a young man just out of college. The kindliness of the man, and his mastery over literary as well as political and social topics, filled me with an admiration and esteem that subsequent acquaintance has only served to intensify. He is evidently a man of great powers of acquisition and retention, coupled with rapid assimilation of knowledge. He seems to have gleaned in almost every field, and to be always ready to enrich almost any subject with strikingly original suggestions. I have heard him say that the man who succeeds best is the man who, other things being equal, knows best how to utilize the scraps of time which all men find in their daily life, and which most men waste. Perhaps the application of this principle in his own life may help to account for his marvelous versatility.

Since I left Hiram, I have had an occasional letter from him. After the exciting contest of 1874, I wrote him a note of congratulation on his triumphant reelection in the face of the bitter calumnies with which he was at that time assailed. His graceful response closed with these words: "I am resting, and reading Goethe's biography, and letting the calm of his great life fall into my own." I count the date of my acquaintance with General Garfield an event in my life.

Very truly yours,

ISAAC N. DEXMON.

President B A HINSDALE, Cleveland, Ohio.

The three following communications to newspapers will illustrate Mr. Garfield's mental aptitudes and habits still more fully. They have appeared at different times the last ten years.

The Golden Age.

. . . Few public men in Washington keep up literary studies. General Garfield is one of the few. No one more constant in attendance at the Capitol than he; no one more laborious on Committees; yet he keeps abreast of current literature, allowing no good book to escape him. When a long-winded and unimportant discussion blows up in the House, watch Garfield. He is an economist of time. Chatting and buttonholing as he goes, he quietly glides out, passes through the rotunda, and escapes into the serene realm of Mr. Spofford, where, amid all that amplitude of books, he regales himself in reading and in literary conversation. He and Mr. Spofford are close friends, and whenever a box of new books arrives from New York or Europe, a message gets to Mr. Garfield to that effect, and he has the first peep. He is a late student. He burns the mid-

night gas. In his position, no man can study continuously till the benign night, which hushes the world and sends office-seekers and log-rollers to bed, gives repose to his door-bell, and leaves him a few hours for himself. Here once more comes to his aid that royal health of his. Thus Mr. Congressman Garfield is able to keep his mind freshened by delightful letters, and to prosecute those more rugged investigations in law, social science, philosophy, and politics, in which the coming statesmen of America must be experts.

The Chicago Tribune.

. . . Garfield is a man of infinite resources. He is one of the half dozen men in Congress who read books. He is one of the few persons in political life here who, in the tremendous crush and pressure of the winter's business, find time to follow a course of light reading. No man has had a more arduous place in the last two Congresses than the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. And no one ever charged him with neglect of duty. Yet Garfield finds time to read nearly all the new books, and to keep up a regular course of readings in the old ones. He has a hungry brain and a wonderful constitution. This has been the method of his busy life. The last few weeks have warned him that he can not stand the racket. Garfield reads everywhere—in the cars going to the Capitol, in the cars returning from his daily work, and in his committee room. He will fight Jim Beck about the necessity of building fortifications at distant points, and contest with a Granger from the Modoc country about the Modoc claims; yet, in the interim, will find time to give ten minutes to "silly old Bozzy," or some of his charming comrades. I should say that the secret of Garfield's resources in debate, the freshness of his illustrations, his ready references to literature in all its branches, is due to his voracious literary appetite. "I have read," he said, "since I have been lying here, struggling with this pain, eighteen volumes; and I have indexed and commonplace them all. Pretty fair work, I take it, for six weeks of mid-summer in Washington."

The Rockland Journal, July 3, 1880.

We take pleasure in giving our readers the following sketch of our next President when in college. It is from the pen of Prof Lavalette Wilson, of the Mountain Institute, Haverstraw, and of course full of interest at this time:

To the Editor of the Journal:

Some reminiscences of our candidate for President, from one who has known him person-

ally longer perhaps than any other resident of this county, may not be without interest.

Mr. Garfield was a native and resident of Ohio, and entered Williams College, Mass., at the beginning of the junior year (September, 1854), in the same class with your correspondent. In a class of forty or more he immediately took a stand above all others for accurate scholarship in every branch, but particularly distinguishing himself as a writer, reasoner, and debater. He was remarkable for going to the bottom of every subject which came before him, and seeing and presenting it in an entirely new light. His essays written at that time, not of the commonplace character too common in college compositions, can even now be read with pleasure and admiration. While an indefatigable worker, he was by no means a bookworm or recluse, but one of the most companionable of men, highly gifted and entertaining in conversation, ready to enjoy and to give a joke, and having a special faculty for drawing out the knowledge of those with whom he conversed, thus enriching his own stock of information from the acquirements of others. Mr. Garfield even then showed that magnetic power, which he now exhibits in a remarkable degree in public life, of surrounding himself with men of various talents, and of employing each to the best advantage in his sphere. When questions for discussion arose in the college societies, Garfield would give each of his allies a point to investigate; books and documents from all the libraries would be overhauled; and the mass of facts thus obtained being brought together, Garfield would analyze the whole, assign each of the associates his part, and they would go into the battle to conquer. He was always in earnest, and persistent in carrying his point, often against apparently insurmountable obstacles; and in college election contests (which are often more intense than national elections) he was always successful.

He showed perfect uprightness of character, was religious without cant or austerity, and his influence for good was wide-felt.

The intimate associations which occur in college life give the best opportunity of knowing the inner character of man. From Garfield I never heard an angry word, or a hasty expression, or a sentence which needed to be recalled. He possessed equanimity of temper, self-possession, and self-control in the highest degree. What is more, I never heard a profane or improper word, or an indelicate allusion, from his lips. He was in habits, speech, and example a pure man.

Arising, some may say, from his own early

struggles, but as I believe from his native nobility of character, was his sympathy for the suffering or depressed or humble. He would find out their wishes or desires, their best points, and where their ability lay, and encourage them to advancement and success. Not even now has he any of that unapproachability and *hauteur* which too often accompany great talents and high position. He is a democrat in the highest sense of the word; no matter how humble a position a person may hold, how unfashionably dressed, how countryfied in appearance, or lacking in knowledge of the usage of polite society, he will feel at ease in Mr. Garfield's presence, and receive the same courtesy, and probably greater attention than would the Prince of Wales.

On entering Williams College Mr. Garfield was uncommitted in national politics. Perhaps his first lesson came from John L. Goodrich, who at that time represented in Congress the western district of Massachusetts. In the fall of 1855 Mr. Goodrich delivered a political address in Williamstown on the history of the Kansas-Nebraska struggle, and the efforts of the handful of Republicans then in Congress to defeat the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. As Mr. Goodrich spoke, I sat at Garfield's side and saw him drink in every word. He said, as we passed out: "This subject is entirely new to me; I am going to know all about it." He sent for documents, studied them until he became perfectly familiar with the history of the Anti-slavery struggle, and from that hour has been the thorough Republican—the champion of right against injustice—that he is at the present hour.

When Mr. Garfield went to Congress, Charles Sumner was the widest reader in either House. It was but a short time until Garfield's book-list at the Library of Congress, according to Mr. Spofford, the librarian, was next to Sumner's in length. Whether Mr. Garfield ever passed Mr. Sumner, I do not know; but certainly since Sumner's death no man in public life in Washington has made so large a use of the library.

CHAPTER VIII.

LEADING TRAITS OF CHARACTER SUMMED UP.

THIS life is a narrative and not a critical history. To give a final estimate—if there be such a thing—of the life and character of a man so prominent in public affairs

as General Garfield while he is at the height of his prominence, is difficult or impossible. Especially is this so at the opening of an exciting political campaign in which he is the standard-bearer of a great political party. Recognizing this fully, it is, nevertheless, fitting to close this sketch with a general view of the man.

A strong frame, broad shoulders, deep chest, powerful vital apparatus, and a massive head furnish the physical basis of James A. Garfield's mental life. He is six feet high. Mr Townsend's fuller description is thus: "He is a large, well-fed, ruddy, brown-bearded man, weighing about two hundred and twenty pounds, with Ohio-German colors, blue eyes, military face, erect figure and shoulders, large back and thighs and broad chest, and evidently bred in the country on a farm. His large mouth is full of strong truth. His nose, chin, and brows are strongly pronounced. A large brain, with room for play of thought and long application, rises high above his clear, discerning, enjoying eyes. He sometimes suggests a country Samson." He is physically capable of an indefinite amount of hard work.

The foregoing record of his achievements, and the extracts from his speeches that are to follow, give the gauge of his mental power and quality. He excels in the patient accumulation of facts, and in bold generalization. He has great power of logical analysis, and stands with the first in power of rhetorical exposition. He has the instincts and habits of a scholar. As a student, he loves to roam in every field of knowledge. He delights in creations of the imagination, poetry, fiction, and art; loves the abstract things of philosophy; takes a keen interest in scientific research; gathers into his capacious storehouse the facts of history and politics; and throws over the whole the life and power of his own originality. He is not a Scaliger, a Descartes, or a Newton; no man in public life—not even Mr. Gladstone—can be these; but his general culture is broad, deep, and generous. No public man these last ten years has more won upon our scholars, scientists, men of letters, and the cultivated classes generally. Says Mr. Townsend: "Since John Quincy Adams, no President has had Garfield's scholarship,

which is equally up to this age of wider facts." As an orator he lacks the massive grandeur of Webster, the brilliant declamation of Clay, and the fervid passion of Henry; but his speeches are strong in fact, ribbed with principle, lucid in arrangement, rich in illustration, polished in diction, and vital with the power of a great nature. Not trained to the bar, he readily adapts himself both to the court and to the jury; he catches at once the ear of the House of Representatives; he meets the expectations of those more fastidious people who cluster about the colleges, and in the literary centers; and, on due occasion, he sways great popular assemblies at his will.

His moral character is the fit crown of his physical and intellectual nature. His mind is pure, his heart kind, his nature and habits simple, his generosity unbounded. An old friend told me the other day: "I have never found anything in the world to compare with Garfield's heart." His range and power of appreciation are great. He becomes absorbed in whatever interests him; sees reflected in the man or subject his own mind; and is, therefore, liable unconsciously to exaggerate the ability of a man or the value of a subject. He is not suspicious, and has great faith in human nature. For the most part, he has neglected material acquisition; but his means, as well as his time and talents, are at the service of those who need them. His hospitality is bounded only by the capacity of his home. He is a man who makes the most of his home, and is eminently happy in his domestic relations. Mrs. Garfield is a lady of strong mind, of rich cultivation, her husband's fit companion. He is an excellent converser on a great variety of subjects, and is a favorite in cultivated circles. While respecting the mental qualities that give success in the honorable accumulation of wealth, he is no lover of money or hanger-on of rich men. He remembers the day of small things. His sympathies with the toilers are quick and generous. He remembers the pit from which he was himself dugged—the rock from which he was hewn. At a time when certain journals were denouncing him as having grown rich by corruption, he lived in a humble house in the retired village of Hiram; and nothing about

his home, save his library, stood in contrast to the homes of his neighbors. He is a man of the strictest private and public integrity, and is responsive to the delicate points of honor. No man charges him with being a party to a questionable private transaction; and when the charges made against his public life cease to be useful to the partisan, they will fall into the pit provided for slanderers. I am not aware that a single man of character, who has come into close relations with General Garfield, lays any charge of dishonesty or wrong at his door. These things are left to those inferior men whose instincts draw them to the gutter and who fatten upon garbage. Not long ago the representative of a great public journal asked me: "What do the people who know General Garfield think of his integrity?" Had my wits been about me, I should have answered: "Did the men who saw Chevalier Bayard hold the bridge of Garigliano against the Spaniards doubt his courage? Did those who saw Sir Philip Sidney fall on Zutphen field question his chivalry?" As it was, I first answered in a general way, and then added: "I have known General Garfield twenty-seven years; I do not say that I know him as well as one man can know another; I know him as well as I can know another; and there is no interest that one man can confide to his fellow man, that I would not freely intrust to him." A little later, another reporter called upon me in my study to obtain some facts that might be of interest to the public. I had just thrown the private letters that General Garfield had written to me upon the floor. There were some hundreds in all; the first written in January, 1857, the last on the eve of the Chicago Convention. I said to him: "Here are my Garfield letters. Some are scrappy notes, others dissertations. They are one side of a long and intimate correspondence. They relate to a great many subjects: business, domestic matters, religion, politics, life at home, and life abroad. With few exceptions, I have not read them since they were first received. No man is more zealous of his honor than am I; but I would be willing, so far as affecting his character is concerned, to have them go into every news-

paper in the land without my even reading them over."

The closer men have come into contact with him, the greater has been their faith in him. He has inspired confidence and respect in all large-minded and generous men, without regard to politics. Withal, he is a religious man. As a boy, he was never the bully or swaggerer that fiction sometimes makes him, but strictly moral and serious. Although abundantly able and willing to defend to the utmost his own rights, or the rights of the weak and helpless, by physical force, if necessary, he was peaceable and self-contained. Before reaching his majority, he made public profession of religion, and has continued a member of the Church to this day. Like all men of his thought and reading, he understands the difficult religious questions that modern criticism and science have started; he no doubt thinks that the old theologies must be partially reconstructed; but his native piety, his early training, and his own sober convictions, hold him fast to the great truths of revealed religion. Rev. Dr. Butler, a Lutheran minister of Washington, says: "I have not unfrequently seen him supporting his venerable mother upon his strong arm as they slowly walked together from the house of God. He worships regularly in the humble Disciples' church."

The public life and character of a public man should be in harmony with his private life and character. This is not always true of such men, but it is eminently true of General Garfield. He is of a piece throughout. I shall first notice the bent of his political thought.

An able journalist speaks of the "strong tendency of politicians to neglect real politics—that is, the *business* of the country—for the work of electioneering and management; and of a growing disposition on the part of the public to let politicians of this class take possession of the Government, and use it in their own game for their own hands." These complaints are well grounded. Unfortunately, there has sprung up these last years in our country a class of public men who take no real interest in public questions. They care nothing for the exposition of sound political doctrine. They do not aspire to be

teachers of the people, or to lead the thought and the conscience of the nation. Their political activity may be summed up thus: Violent antagonism to the opposing party; a careful looking after public patronage; the organization of the "machine"; the cunning and selfish manipulation of the voters. To political reform, to the betterment of the Government, to raising the standard of public life, they are indifferent. General Garfield is the farthest removed from these. No sooner had he entered Congress than he entered heart and soul upon the real questions of the day. The war over and reconstruction passed, he saw that American politics were entering upon a new era. No man could now serve the nation by rehearsing the old slavery debates; by fighting over the battles of the war on the floors of Congress, by unduly prolonging controversies that were for ever settled. He saw that what the country needed was wise discussion and legislation on the civil service, the revenue, currency, banking, resumption, and the hundred other questions that are by no means sentimental, that do not appeal to the imagination, but that are dry, statistical, unpoetic, and as distasteful as possible to your political "war horse." In a noble speech on the currency, delivered in 1868, he said:

I am aware that financial subjects are dull and uninviting in comparison with those heroic themes which have absorbed the attention of Congress for the last five years. To turn from the consideration of armies and navies, victories and defeats, to the array of figures which exhibits the debt, expenditure, taxation, and industry of the nation, requires no little courage and self-denial; but to these questions we must come, and to their solution Congress, political parties, and all thoughtful citizens must give their best efforts for many years to come

Again, only last year he said:

The man who wants to serve his country must put himself in the line of the leading thought, and that is the restoration of business, trade, commerce, industry, science, political economy, hard money, and honest payment of all obligations; and the man who can add anything in the direction of the accomplishment of any of these purposes is a public benefactor.

He grappled with these politico-economic

questions with a giant's strength and a missionary's zeal. This was in harmony with his saying, that "the man who wants to serve his country must put himself in the line of the leading thought." And that this is the leading thought, since 1866, no man of sense can deny. The enormous debt contracted during the war, the multiplication and growth of industries, the rapid differentiation of American society, compel real politicians to think and work in this direction. It was Mr. Garfield's clear perception of these facts that led him, in December, 1865, to desire a place on the House Committee of Ways and Means. Since that day he has stood with his party on party questions, though sometimes recoiling from what he thought extreme measures; but nothing is risked in saying that his most valuable services, both in the House and on the stump, have been in dealing with these politico-economic questions. Vigorously to denounce the "Solid South," or actively "to stir up the Brigadiers," any time these last ten years, is no proof of either ability or courage; but to mold national legislation and educate the people on these difficult subjects is a proof, and a high proof, of both. Mr. Garfield's native and acquired mental habits well fitted him for such a work. His patience in gathering facts, power of generalization, scientific habit of mind, and faculty of lucid exposition could hardly have found worthier employment. He explored all accessible sources of knowledge that could serve him, and through him the public. He extended his studies in systematic political economy; gleaned the field of American thought and legislation on industrial and fiscal matters; and went to the Old World for her larger and riper experience. He knew that this is America, and that many of the conditions of life are not the same here that they are on the Eastern continent; but he knew also that Americans are a division of the human race, that human life did not begin anew on these Western shores, and that to be useful and permanent our laws must recognize what is universal in human nature. He has never had a particle of sympathy with the sentiment put in the famous question, "What is abroad to us?" He has striven to make

knowledge the basis of legislation. He said in 1868:

Our public debt, the greatest financial fact of this century, stands in the pathway of all political parties, and, like the Egyptian Sphinx, propounds its riddles. All the questions which sprang out of the public debt, such as loans, bonds, tariffs, internal taxation, banking and currency, present greater difficulties than usually come within the scope of American politics. They can not be settled by force of numbers, nor carried by assault as an army storms the works of an enemy. Patient examination of facts, careful study of principles which do not appear upon the surface, and which involve the most difficult problems of political economy, are the weapons of this warfare. No sentiment of national pride should make us unmindful of the fact that we have less experience in this direction than any other civilized nation. If this fact is not creditable to our intellectual reputation, it at least affords a proof that our people have not hitherto been crushed under the burdens of taxation. We must consent to be instructed by the experience of other nations, and be willing to approach these questions, not with the dogmatism of teachers, but as seekers after truth.

In working along this line, his materials soon began to grow into a prodigious store. These he carried partly in his retentive memory, partly in annotations in his books, and partly in an ingenious mechanical contrivance for assorting and preserving such material, the germ of which he borrowed from his friend, the publicist Lieber. A journal lying before me remarks: "Those who have watched General Garfield during his long career in Congress, must often have been struck with his remarkable faculty of discerning, at short notice, any question that may arise. This is largely due to the fact that, for twenty years, he has been accumulating what is, perhaps, now the best collection of scrap-books in the country." As he grew in the House, and especially when he became the leader of his party, and in a sense of the House, this accumulated material was as useful to him as his rapid powers of acquisition. Few men have a just idea of what his position in the House implies. Paradoxical as it may sound, many of his best speeches were never made; by which I mean that, in order to be ready to take part in a debate on short notice, he was

obliged to make preparation on special subjects in advance, and it sometimes happened that a turn in the proceedings adjourned the speech indefinitely. Senator Hoar of Massachusetts, a man of sober statements, said in his Worcester eulogy: "Since the year 1864, you can not think of a question which has been debated in Congress, or discussed before the American people, in regard to which you will not find, if you wish instruction, the argument on one side stated, and stated in almost every instance better than by anybody else, in some speech made in the House of Representatives or on the hustings by Mr. Garfield."

To perform these great labors has required great courage, as well as great intellectual ability. Of course Mr. Garfield is a party man; it will be for history to sit in judgment both on him and his party; but his relations to his party and to his immediate constituency evince courage of a high order. At the very time of his nomination at Chicago he was standing almost alone in the House on a party question. He has never believed or acted upon that degrading theory of representation which bids the representative carry out the thought or impulse that may be uppermost in men's minds for the day or even the year. In the Ohio Senate Chamber, after his election to the Senate of the United States, he said.

During the twenty years that I have been in public life (almost eighteen of it in the Congress of the United States) I have tried to do one thing. Whether I was mistaken or otherwise, it has been the plan of my life to follow my convictions, at whatever personal cost to myself. I have represented for many years a district in Congress whose approbation I greatly desired; but, though it may seem perhaps a little egotistical to say it, I yet desired still more the approbation of one person, and his name was Garfield. He is the only man that I am compelled to sleep with, and eat with, and live with, and die with; and if I could not have his approbation, I should have had companionship.

Mr. Garfield is a singularly round and symmetrical man. He has been a man of mark in education, war, law, and politics; and he might have been a man of mark in any of the callings that do not demand special genius. As a politician he has always

relied upon mental and moral forces. He has never been connected with a "ring" or belonged to a "group"; he has never constructed or managed a "machine"; to "bargains," "slates," and "booms" he is a stranger. He has never sought office, save as his abilities and character have commended him to the public mind. This history does not embrace a full account of the Chicago Convention, in which his last great services to the public were rendered. It suffices to say, his work and bearing there under circumstances most embarrassing, when a less well-poised man would have lost his head, are, for the time, the fitting close of his great career.

But my outline is finished. Its subject served his country ably and faithfully in war, but as a Presidential candidate he stands distinctly upon his civic record. Says Senator Hoar. "No President of the United States, since John Quincy Adams, began to bring to the Presidential office, when he entered upon it, anything like the experience in statesmanship of James A. Garfield."

All in all, Mr. Garfield is one of the best products of our American soil and institutions. He began life nearly fifty years ago in the Ohio forest, poor as the poorest; and by his own exertions, abilities, and character, he has made his way upward until within a stone's cast of the highest place. His road has led him by the log-house, chopping-fallow, district school, tow-path, academy, and college, to the Ohio Senate, the army, the House of Representatives, a Senatorial election, and a Presidential nomination. He sums up American life in himself.

I do not believe that the Chicago Convention could have nominated another man who touches the American mind and heart with equal power at so many points. His early life of toil and hardship, as well as his sympathy with the working classes, endears him to the toiling millions. There is a pathos

in that early history which touches the heart of the humble worker. His masterly grasp of politico-economic questions, and his steady fealty to sound doctrine in all the financial madness and treachery of the last ten years, gain him the support of merchants, manufacturers, and bankers. The school-teachers of the land count him one of their number. He is more than acceptable to the religious men, to temperance people, and to the ministers of the Gospel. Enter the chill atmosphere of the college and university lecture and recitation rooms, whose masters are not stirred by campaign stories, but who respect thoroughness, scholarship, and noble character, and you find that he is a favorite. Enter the bare quarters of the toiling student, who is struggling with his poverty and his lessons, and the name of Garfield is an inspiration. A friend wrote me, the evening of the nomination, from the great University of Michigan: "I can not refrain from dropping you a line to-night to congratulate you on the well-deserved triumph of your friend General Garfield. Everybody here is in high glee. No other candidate would have been so strong. Now let the Democrats do their best."

Once more the American people have an opportunity to elevate to the Chief Magistracy of the Republic a great civilian. History will record whether they know their opportunity. However that may be, no Presidential nomination for years has so stirred the best elements of American life. Even the casual newspaper reader has not failed to notice the enthusiasm awakened among the more serious, thoughtful, and moral of our people. His record of twenty years is the pledge that, if elected to the office of President, he will give the Nation an administration that in ability, purity, and honor will be commensurate with its own greatness.

PART II.

GENERAL CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

I

THE following sketch of General Arthur, the Republican Vice-Presidential candidate, first appeared in the "New York Times":

General Chester A. Arthur was born in Franklin county, Vt., October 5, 1830. He is the oldest of a family of two sons and five daughters. His father was the Rev. Dr. William Arthur, a Baptist clergyman who emigrated to this country from the County Antrim, Ireland, in his eighteenth year, and died October 27, 1875, in Newtonville, near Albany. Dr. Arthur was in many respects a remarkable man. He acquired extended fame, not only in his calling, but also in the domains of authorship. His work on Family Names is regarded the world over as one of the curiosities of English erudite literature. From 1855 to 1863 he was pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church of this city. He also filled the pulpits of Baptist churches at Bennington, Hinesburg, Fairfield, and Williston, in Vermont, and York, Perry, Greenwich, Schenectady, Lansingburg, Hoosic, West Troy, and Newtonville, in this State. His other son made a gallant record in the war of the rebellion, and is now a paymaster of the regular army, with the rank of major.

General Arthur was educated at Union College, and was graduated in the class of '49. After leaving college he taught a country school during two years in Vermont, and then, having managed by rigid economy to save about \$500, he started for this city and

entered the law office of ex-Judge E. D. Culver as a student. After being admitted to the bar, he formed a partnership with his intimate friend and room-mate, Henry D. Gardiner, with the intention of practicing in the West, and for three months they roamed about in the Western States in search of an eligible site; but in the end returned to this city, where they hung out their joint shingle, and entered upon a successful career almost from the start. General Arthur soon after married the daughter of Lieutenant Herndon, United States Navy, who was lost at sea, and who calmly went down to death smoking a cigar. Congress voted a gold medal to his widow in recognition of the conspicuous bravery he displayed on that occasion. Mrs. Arthur died only a short time ago.

In 1852, Jonathan and Juliet Lemmon, Virginianslaveholders, intending to emigrate to Texas, came to this city to await the sailing of a steamer, bringing eight slaves with them. A writ of *habeas corpus* was obtained from Judge Paine to test the question whether the slaves were not freed by the act of bringing them into free territory. Judge Paine rendered a decision holding that they were, and ordering the Lemmon slaves to be liberated. Henry L. Clinton was one of the counsel for the slaveholders. A howl of rage went up from the South, and the Virginia Legislature authorized the Attorney-General of that State to assist in taking an appeal. William M. Evarts and Chester A. Arthur were employed to represent the people, and they won their case, which then

went to the Supreme Court of the United States. Charles O'Connor here espoused the cause of the slaveholders, but he, too, was beaten by Messrs. Evarts and Arthur, and a long step was taken toward the emancipation of the black race. Another great service was rendered by General Arthur in the same cause in 1856. Lizzie Jennings, a respectable colored woman, was put off a Fourth-avenue car, with violence, after she had paid her fare. General Arthur sued on her behalf, and secured a verdict of five hundred dollars damages. The next day the company issued an order to permit colored persons to ride on their cars, and the other car companies quickly followed their example. Before that the Sixth-avenue company ran a few special cars for colored persons, and the other lines refused to let them ride at all.

General Arthur was a delegate to the Convention at Saratoga that founded the Republican party. Previous to the outbreak of the war he was Judge-Advocate of the Second Brigade of the State Militia, and Governor Edwin D. Morgan, soon after his inauguration, selected him to fill the position of Engineer in Chief of his staff. In 1861 he held the post of Inspector-General, and soon afterward was advanced to that of Quartermaster-General, which he held until the expiration of Morgan's term of office. No higher encomium can be passed upon him than the mention of the fact that, although the war account of the State of New York was at least ten times larger than that of any other State, yet it was the first audited and allowed in Washington, and without the deduction of a dollar; while the quartermasters' accounts from other States were reduced from \$1,000,000 to \$10,000,000 each. During his term of office every present sent to him was immediately returned. Among others, a prominent clothing house offered him a magnificent uniform, and a printing-house sent him a costly saddle and trappings. Both gifts were indignantly rejected. When Mr. Arthur became Quartermaster-General he was poor. When his term expired he was poorer still. He had opportunities to make millions unquestioned. Contracts larger than the world had ever seen were at his disposal. He had to provide for the clothing, arming, and transportation of hun-

dreds of thousands of men. Speaking of him at this period, a friend says: "So jealous was he of his integrity that I have known instances where he could have made thousands of dollars legitimately, and yet refused to do it on the ground that he was a public officer, and meant to be, like Cæsar's wife, 'above suspicion.' His own words to me in regard to this matter amply illustrate his character: 'If I had misappropriated five cents, and on walking down town saw two men talking together, I would imagine they were talking of my dishonesty, and the very thought would drive me mad.'"

At the expiration of Governor Morgan's term, General Arthur returned to his law practice. Business of the most lucrative character poured in upon him, and the firm of Arthur & Gardiner prospered exceedingly. Much of their work consisted in the collection of war-claims and the drafting of important bills for speedy legislation; and a great deal of General Arthur's time was spent in Albany and Washington, where his uniform success won for him a national reputation. For a short time he held the position of Counsel to the Board of Tax Commissioners of this city, at \$10,000 per annum. Gradually he was drawn into the arena of politics. He nominated, and by his efforts elected, the Hon. Thomas Murphy a State Senator. When the latter resigned the collectorship of the port on November 20, 1871, President Grant nominated General Arthur to the vacant position, and four years later, when his term expired, renominated him, an honor that had never been shown to any previous Collector in the history of the port. He was removed by President Hayes on July 12, 1878, despite the fact that two special committees made searching investigation into his administration, and both reported themselves unable to find anything upon which to base a charge against him. In their *pronunciamientos* announcing the change, both President Hayes and Secretary Sherman bore official witness to the purity of his acts while in office. A petition for his retention was signed by every judge of every court in the city, by all the prominent members of the bar, and by nearly every importing merchant in the collection district; but this General Arthur himself suppressed.

In a letter to Secretary Sherman, reviewing the work of one of the investigating committees, General Arthur produced statistics to show that during his term of over six years in office the percentage of removals was only two and three fourths, against an annual average of twenty-eight per cent. under three immediate predecessors, and an annual average of about twenty-four per cent. since 1857. Of the nine hundred and twenty-three persons in office prior to his appointment, five hundred and thirty-one were still retained on May 1, 1877. All appointments, except two, to the one hundred positions commanding salaries of \$2,000 per year were made on the plan of advancing men from the lower to the higher grades on the recommendation of the heads of bureaus. The reforms which General Arthur instituted in the methods of doing business in the Custom-house were as numerous as they were grateful to the mercantile community. Since his removal he has been engaged in the practice of the law, and in the direction of Republican politics in the State, being chairman of the Republican State Committee. In person he is over six feet in height, broad-shouldered, athletic, and handsome. Like his predecessor, William A. Wheeler, he is an ardent disciple of Walton and a member of the Restigouche Salmon-Fishing Club, which was described in yesterday's "Times." He is a man of great culture and wide experience, an able lawyer, with refined tastes, and manners of the utmost geniality.

II.

GENERAL ARTHUR'S LETTER ACCEPTING THE VICE-PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION.

NEW YORK, *July 15, 1880.*

DEAR SIR: I accept the position assigned me by the great party whose action you announce. This acceptance implies approval of the principles declared by the Convention, but recent usage permits me to add some expression of my own views. The right and duty to secure honesty and order in popular elections is a matter so vital that it must stand in front. The authority of the National Government to preserve from fraud and force elections at which its own officers are chosen is a chief point on which the two

parties are plainly and intensely opposed. Acts of Congress for ten years have, in New York and elsewhere, done much to curb the violence and wrong to which the ballot and the count have been again and again subjected—sometimes despoiling great cities, sometimes stifling the voice of a whole State; often seating, not only in Congress, but on the Bench and in Legislatures, numbers of men never chosen by the people. The Democratic party, since gaining possession of the two Houses of Congress, has made these just laws the object of bitter, ceaseless assault, and, despite all resistance, has hedged them with restrictions cunningly contrived to baffle and paralyze them. This aggressive majority boldly attempted to extort from the Executive his approval of various enactments destructive of these election laws, by revolutionary threats that a constitutional exercise of the veto power would be punished by withholding the appropriations necessary to carry on the Government. And these threats were actually carried out by refusing the needed appropriations, and by forcing an extra session of Congress, lasting for months and resulting in concessions to this usurping demand, which are likely, in many States, to subject the majority to the lawless will of a minority. Ominous signs of public disapproval alone subdued this arrogant power into a sullen surrender for the time being of a part of its demands. The Republican party has strongly approved the stern refusal of its representatives to suffer the overthrow of statutes believed to be salutary and just. It has always insisted, and now insists, that the Government of the United States of America is empowered and in duty bound to effectually protect the elections denoted by the Constitution as national. More than this, the Republican party holds, as a cardinal point in its creed, that the Government should, by every means known to the Constitution, protect all American citizens everywhere in the full enjoyment of their civil and political rights. As a great part of its work of reconstruction, the Republican party gave the ballot to the emancipated slave as his right and defense. A large increase in the number of members of Congress, and of the Electoral College, from the former slaveholding States, was the im-

mediate result. The history of recent years abounds in evidence that in many ways and in many places—especially where their number has been great enough to endanger Democratic control—the very men by whose elevation to citizenship this increase of representation was effected, have been debarred and robbed of their voice and their vote. It is true that no State statute or Constitution in so many words denies or abridges the exercise of their political rights; but the modes employed to bar their way are no less effectual. It is a suggestive and startling thought that the increased power derived from the enfranchisement of a race now denied its share in governing the country—wielded by those who lately sought the overthrow of the Government—is now the sole reliance to defeat the party which represented the sovereignty and nationality of the American people in the greatest crisis of our history. Republicans cherish none of the resentments which may have animated them during the actual conflict of arms. They long for a full and real reconciliation between the sections which were needlessly and lamentably at strife; they sincerely offer the hand of good will, but they ask in return a pledge of good faith. They deeply feel that the party, whose career is so illustrious in great and patriotic achievement, will not fulfill its destiny until peace and prosperity are established in all the land, nor until liberty of thought, conscience, and action, and equality of opportunity shall be not merely cold formalities of statute, but living birthrights, which the humble may confidently claim and the powerful dare not deny.

The resolution referring to the public service seems to me deserving of approval. Surely, no man should be the incumbent of an office the duties of which he is for any cause unfit to perform, who is lacking in the ability, fidelity, or integrity which a proper administration of such office demands. This sentiment would doubtless meet with general acquiescence; but opinion has been widely divided upon the wisdom and practicability of the various reformatory schemes which have been suggested, and of certain proposed regulations governing appointments to public office. The efficiency of

such regulations has been distrusted, mainly because they have seemed to exalt mere educational and abstract tests above general business capacity, and even special fitness for the particular work in hand. It seems to me that the rules which should be applied to the management of the public service may properly conform, in the main, to such as regulate the conduct of successful private business. Original appointments should be based upon ascertained fitness. The tenure of office should be stable. Positions of responsibility should, so far as practicable, be filled by the promotion of worthy and efficient officers. The investigation of all complaints, and the punishment of all official misconduct, should be prompt and thorough. These views, which I have long held, repeatedly declared, and uniformly applied when called upon to act, I find embodied in the resolution, which, of course, I approve. I will add that, by the acceptance of public office, whether high or low, one does not, in my judgment, escape any of his responsibilities as a citizen, or lose or impair any of his rights as a citizen; and that he should enjoy absolute liberty to think and speak and act in political matters according to his own conscience, provided only that he honorably, faithfully, and fully discharges all his official duties.

The resumption of specie payments—one of the fruits of Republican policy—has brought the return of abundant prosperity, and the settlement of many distracting questions. The restoration of sound money, the large reduction of our public debt and of the burden of interest, the high advancement of the public credit, all attest the ability and courage of the Republican party to deal with such financial problems as may hereafter demand solution. Our paper currency is now as good as gold, and silver is performing its legitimate function for the purposes of change. The principles which should govern the relations of these elements of the currency are simple and clear. There must be no deteriorated coin, no depreciated paper. And every dollar, whether of metal or paper, should stand the test of the world's fixed standard.

The value of popular education can hardly be overstated. Although its interests must

of necessity be chiefly confided to voluntary effort and the individual action of the several States, they should be encouraged, so far as the Constitution permits, by the generous coöperation of the National Government. The interests of the whole country demand that the advantages of our common-school system should be brought within the reach of every citizen, and that no revenues of the nation or of the States should be devoted to the support of sectarian schools.

Such changes should be made in the present tariff and system of taxation as will relieve any overburdened industry or class, and enable our manufacturers and artisans to compete successfully with those of other lands.

The Government should aid works of internal improvement national in their character, and should promote the development of our water-courses and harbors wherever the general interests of commerce require.

Four years ago, as now, the nation stood at the threshold of a Presidential election, and the Republican party, in soliciting a continuance of its ascendancy, founded its hope of success not upon its promises, but upon its history. Its subsequent course has been such as to strengthen the claims which it then made to the confidence and support of the country. On the other hand, considerations more urgent than have ever be-

fore existed forbid the accession of its opponents to power. Their success, if success attends them, must chiefly come from the united support of that section which sought the forcible disruption of the Union, and which, according to all the teachings of our past history, will demand ascendancy in the councils of the party to whose triumph it will have made by far the largest contribution.

There is the gravest reason for apprehension that exorbitant claims upon the public Treasury, by no means limited to the hundreds of millions already covered by bills introduced in Congress within the past four years, would be successfully urged if the Democratic party should succeed in supplementing its present control of the national Legislature by electing the Executive also.

There is danger in intrusting the control of the whole law-making power of the Government to a party which has, in almost every Southern State, repudiated obligations quite as sacred as those to which the faith of the nation now stands pledged.

I do not doubt that success awaits the Republican party, and that its triumph will assure a just, economical, and patriotic administration. I am, respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

C. A. ARTHUR.

*To the Hon. GEORGE F. HOAR, President of
the Republican National Convention*

PART III.

GENERAL GARFIELD'S SPEECHES.

Numerous quotations from General Garfield's speeches have already been made in the history of his public life. Generally, however, these were made to verify or to illustrate points of history, rather than to give an exposition of positive doctrine. In this third part of the work it is proposed to present such selections from his speeches—whole speeches or extracts—as will fully present his views on current public questions. A fitting introduction to such selections will be a list of his speeches made in the House of Representatives, with the dates of their delivery. It is believed that no man now in public life has swept over so wide a field of discussion. In no way can the breadth of that field be better shown than by this list. Only those speeches that have appeared in pamphlet editions are included.

1. Free Commerce between the States: On the Bill to declare the Raritan and Atlantic Railroad a Legal Structure, March 24 and 31, 1864.

2. Constitutional Amendment to Abolish Slavery, January 13, 1865.

3. Freedman's Bureau: Restoration of the Rebel States, February 1, 1866.

4. The Public Debt and Specie Payments, March 16, 1866.

5. To Establish a National Bureau of Education, June 8, 1866.

6. On the Bill to place the Rebel States under Military Control, February 8, 1867.

7. On Reconstruction, and the Constitutional Power of Congress to control the Army, January 17, 1868.

8. On the Impeachment of Andrew Johnson, February 29, 1868.

9. The Currency, May 15, 1868.

10. Taxation of United States Bonds, in reply to Hons. Fred. A. Pike and B. F. Butler, July 15, 1868.

11. Ninth Census, December 16, 1869.

12. Public Expenditures and the Civil Service, March 14, 1870.

13. The Tariff, April 1, 1870.

14. Currency and the Banks, June 7, 1870.

15. Debate on the Currency Bill, June 15, 1870.

16. The McGarrah Claim, February 20, 1871.

17. The Right to originate Revenue Bills, March 3, 1871.

18. Enforcement of the Fourteenth Amendment, April 4, 1871.

19. Public Expenditures: their Increase and Diminution, January 23, 1872.

20. National Aid to Education, February 6, 1872.

21. Revenues and Expenditures, March 5, 1874.

22. Currency and the Public Faith, April 8, 1874.

23. Appropriations of the First Session of the Forty-third Congress, June 23, 1874.

24. Cheap Transportation and Railways, June 22, 1874.

25. Amnesty: Reply to Hon. B. H. Hill, January 12, 1876.

26. Can the Democratic Party be safely intrusted with the Administration of the Government? August 4, 1876.

27. John Winthrop and Samuel Adams, December 19, 1876.

28. Counting the Electoral Vote, January 25, 1877.

29. Repeal of the Resumption Law, November 16, 1877.

30. The New Scheme of American Finance: a Reply to Hon. W. D. Kelley, March 6, 1878.

31. Carpenter's Painting, "Lincoln and Emancipation," February 12, 1878.

32. The Policy of Pacification, and the Prosecutions in Louisiana, February 19, 1878.

33. The Army and the Public Peace, May 21, 1878.

34. The Tariff, June 4, 1878.

35. Joseph Henry, January 16, 1879.

36. Relation of the National Government to Science, February 11, 1879.

37. Sugar Tariff, February 26, 1879.

38. Speeches at the Extra Session, March 18 to July 1, 1879, embracing these titles: Revolution in Congress; Close of Debate on First Army Bill; Legislative Appropriation Bill; Second Army Appropriation Bill; Judicial Appropriation Bill; Judicial Appropriation Bill, Nullification; Defense of Union Soldiers of Seceded States; Resumption and the Currency; The New Silver Bill; The Mississippi River an Object of National Care; The Revived Doctrine of State Sovereignty; Ancient and Modern Panics.

39. Obedience to the Law the Foremost Duty of Congress, March 17, 1880.

40. Pulp and Paper: How News and Public Opinion are manufactured, May 1, 1880.

I.

NATIONAL AID TO EDUCATION.

In the House of Representatives, February 6, 1872.

"The preservation of the means of knowledge among the lowest ranks is of more importance to the public than all the property of all the rich men in the country."—*John Adams's Works*, III. 457.

"That all education should be in the hands of a centralized authority, . . . and be consequently all framed on the same model, and directed to the perpetuation of the same type, is a state of things which, instead of becoming more acceptable, will assuredly be more repugnant to mankind, with every step of their progress, in the unfettered exercise of their highest faculties."—*John Stuart Mill*: "*The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte*," p. 92.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 1043) to establish an

educational fund, and to apply the proceeds of the public lands to the education of the people—

Mr. Garfield, of Ohio, said:

Mr. Speaker. In the few minutes given me, I shall address myself to two questions. The first is. What do we propose by this bill to give to the cause of education? and the second is: How do we propose to give it? Is the gift itself wise, and is the mode in which we propose to give it wise? This arrangement will include all I have to say.

And first, we propose, without any change in the present land policy, to give the net proceeds of the public lands to the cause of education. During the last fifteen years these proceeds have amounted to a little more than thirty-three million dollars, or one per cent. of the entire revenues of the United States for that period. The gift is not great, but yet, in one view of the case, it is princely. To dedicate for the future a fund which is now one per cent. of the revenues of the United States to the cause of education is, to my mind, a great thought, and I am glad to give it my endorsement. It seems to me that, in this act of giving, we almost copy its prototype in what God himself has done on this great continent of ours. In the center of its greatest breadth, where otherwise there might be a desert for ever, he has planted a chain of the greatest lakes on the earth, and the exhalations arising from their pure waters every day come down in gracious showers, and make that a blooming garden which otherwise might be a desert waste. And from our great wilderness lands it is proposed that their proceeds, like the dew, shall fall for ever, not upon the lands, but upon the minds of the children of the nation, giving them, for all time to come, all the blessing and growth and greatness that education can afford. That thought, I say it again, is a great one, worthy of a great nation; and this country will remember the man who formulated it into language, and will remember the Congress that made it law.

The other point is one of even greater practical value and significance just now than this that I have referred to. It is this: How is this great gift to be distributed?

We propose to give it, Mr. Speaker, through our American system of education; and, in giving it, we do not propose to mar in the least degree the harmony and beauty of that system. If we did, I should be compelled to give my voice and vote against the measure; and here and now, when we are inaugurating this policy, I desire to state for myself, and, as I believe, for many who sit around me, that we do here solemnly protest that this gift is not to destroy or disturb, but it is rather to be used through and as a part of, and to be wholly subordinated to what I venture to call our great American system of education. On this question I have been compelled heretofore to differ with many friends of education, here and elsewhere, many who have thought it might be wise for Congress, in certain contingencies, to take charge of the system of education in the States. I will not now discuss the constitutional aspects of that question; but I desire to say that all the philosophy of our educational system forbids that we should take such a course. And, in the few moments awarded to me, I wish to make an appeal for our system as a whole as against any other known to me. We look sometimes with great admiration at a Government like Germany, that can command the light of its education to shine everywhere, that can enforce its school laws everywhere throughout the empire. Under our system we do not rejoice in that, but we rather rejoice that here two forces play with all their vast power upon our system of education. The first is that of the local, municipal power under our State governments. There is the center of responsibility. There is the chief educational power. There can be enforced Luther's great thought of placing on magistrates the duty of educating children.

Luther was the first to perceive that Christian schools were an absolute necessity. In a celebrated paper addressed to the municipal councilors of the empire in 1524, he demanded the establishment of schools in all the villages of Germany. To tolerate ignorance was, in the energetic language of the reformer, to make common cause with the devil. The father of a family who abandoned his children to ignorance was a con-

summate rascal. Addressing the German authorities, he said:

Magistrates, remember that God formally commands you to instruct children. This divine commandment parents have transgressed by indolence, by lack of intelligence, and because of overwork.

The duty devolves upon you, magistrates, to call fathers to their duty, and to prevent the return of these evils which we suffer to-day. Give attention to your children. Many parents are like ostriches, content to have laid an egg, but caring for it no longer.

Now, that which constitutes the prosperity of a city is not its treasures, its strong walls, its beautiful mansions, and its brilliant decorations. The real wealth of a city, its safety and its force, is an abundance of citizens, instructed, honest, and cultivated. If in our days we rarely meet such citizens, whose fault is it, if not yours, magistrates, who have allowed our youth to grow up like neglected shrubbery in the forest?

Ignorance is more dangerous for a people than the armies of an enemy.

After quoting this passage from Luther, Laboulaye, in his eloquent essay entitled "*L'État et ses Limites*," pages 204 and 205, says:

This familiar and true eloquence was not lost. There is not a Protestant country which has not placed in the front rank of its duties the establishment and maintenance of popular schools.

The duties enjoined in these great utterances of Luther are recognized to the fullest extent by the American system. But they are recognized as belonging to the authorities of the State, the county, the township, the local communities. There these obligations may be urged with all the strength of their high sanctions. There may be brought to bear all the patriotism, all the morality, all the philanthropy, all the philosophy of our people; and there it is brought to bear in its noblest and best forms.

But there is another force even greater than that of the State and the local governments. It is the force of private voluntary enterprise, that force which has built up the multitude of private schools, academies, and colleges throughout the United States, not always wisely, but always with enthusiasm and wonderful energy. I say, therefore,

that our local self-government, joined to and coöperating with private enterprise, have made the American system of education what it is.

In further illustration of its merits, I beg leave to allude to a few facts of great significance. The Governments of Europe are now beginning to see that our system is better and more efficient than theirs. The public mind of England is now, and has been for several years, profoundly moved on the subject of education. Several commissioners have lately been sent by the British Government to examine the school systems of other countries, and lay before Parliament the results of their investigations, so as to enable that body to profit by the experience of other nations.

Rev. J. Frazier, one of the assistant commissioners appointed for this purpose, visited this country in 1865, and in the following year made his report to Parliament. While he found much to criticise in our system of education, he did not withhold his expressions of astonishment at the important part which private enterprise played in our system. In concluding his report, he speaks of the United States as "a nation of which it is no flattery or exaggeration to say that it is, if not the most highly, yet certainly the most generally, educated and intelligent people on the globe."

But a more valuable report was delivered to Parliament in 1868, by Matthew Arnold, one of the most cultivated and profound thinkers of England. He was sent by Parliament to examine the schools and universities of the Continent, and, after visiting all the leading states of Europe, and making himself thoroughly familiar with their system of education, he delivered a most searching and able report. In the concluding chapter, he discusses the wants of England on the subject of education. No one who reads that chapter can fail to admire the boldness and power with which he points out the chief obstacles to popular education in England. He exhibits the significant fact that, while during the last half century there has been a general transformation in the civil organization of European governments, England, with all her liberty and progress, is shackled with what he calls a civil organ-

ization, which is, from the top to the bottom of it, not modern. He says:

Transform she must unless she means to come at last to the same sentence as the church of Sardis: "Thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead."

However, on no part of this immense task of transformation have I now to touch, except on that part which relates to education; but this part, no doubt, is the most important of all, and it is the part whose happy accomplishment may render that of all the rest, instead of being troubled and difficult, gradual and easy. . . .

Obligatory instruction is talked of. But what is the capital difficulty in the way of obligatory instruction, or, indeed, any national system of instruction in this country? It is this, that the moment the working class of this country have this question of instruction really brought home to them, their self-respect will make them demand, like the working classes on the Continent, public schools, and not schools which the clergyman, or the squire, or the mill-owner calls "my school!" And what is the capital difficulty in the way of giving them public schools? It is this, that the public school for the people must rest upon the municipal organization of the country. In France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, the public elementary school has, and exists by having, the commune, and the municipal government of the commune, as its foundations, and it could not exist without them. But we, in England, have our municipal organization still to get; the country districts, with us, have at present only the feudal and ecclesiastical organization of the Middle Ages, or of France before the revolution. . . .

The real preliminary to an effective system of popular education is, in fact, to provide the country with an effective municipal organization; and here, then, is at the outset an illustration of what I said, that modern societies need a civil organization which is modern.

In the early part of 1870 a report was made to the Minister of Public Instruction by Mr. C. Hippeau, a man of great learning, and who in the previous year had been ordered by the French Government to visit the United States and make a careful study of our system of public education. In summing up his conclusions, at the end of his report, he expresses opinions which are remarkable for their boldness, when we remember the character of the French Government at that time; and his recommenda-

tions have a most significant application to the principle under consideration. I translate his concluding paragraphs:

What impresses me most strongly as the result of this study of public instruction in the United States, is the admirable power of private enterprise in a country where the citizens early adopted the habit of foreseeing their own wants for themselves; of meeting together and acting in concert; of combining their means of action, of determining the amount of pecuniary contribution which they will impose upon themselves, and of regulating its use, and, finally, of choosing administrators who shall render them an account of the resources placed at their disposal, and of the use which they may make of their authority.

The marvelous progress made in the United States during the last twenty years would have been impossible, if the national life, instead of being manifested on all points of the surface, had been concentrated in a capital, under the pressure of a strongly organized administration, which, holding the people under constant tutelage, wholly relieved them from the care of thinking and acting by themselves and for themselves. Will France enter upon that path of decentralization which will infallibly result in giving a scope, now unknown, to all her vital forces and to the admirable resources which she possesses? In what especially concerns public instruction, shall we see her multiplying, as in America, those free associations, those generous donations which will enable us to place public instruction on the broadest foundation, and to revive in our provinces the old universities that will become more flourishing as the citizens shall interest themselves directly in their progress?

To accomplish this, it will also be necessary that Governments, appreciating the wants of their epoch, shall with good grace relinquish a part of the duties now imposed upon them, and aid the people in supporting the rigid *régime* of liberty, by enlarging the powers of the municipal councils and of the councils of the departments, by favoring associations and public meetings, by opening the freest field to the examination and discussion of national interests; in short, by deserving the eulogy addressed by a man of genius to a great minister of France: "Monseigneur, you have labored ten years to make yourself useless."

I have made these citations to show how strongly the public thought of Europe is moving toward our system of public education as better and freer than theirs. I do not now

discuss the broader political question of State and municipal government as contrasted with centralized government. I am considering what is the best system of organizing the educational work of a nation, not from the political standpoint alone, but from the standpoint of the school-house itself. This work of public education partakes in a peculiar way of the spirit of the human mind in its efforts for culture. The mind must be as free from extraneous control as possible; must work under the inspiration of its own desires for knowledge; and while instructors and books are necessary helps, the fullest and highest success must spring from the power of self-help.

So the best system of education is that which draws its chief support from the voluntary effort of the community, from the individual efforts of citizens, and from those burdens of taxation which they voluntarily impose upon themselves. The assistance proposed in this bill is to be given through the channels of this, our American system. The amount proposed is large enough to stimulate to greater effort and to general emulation the different States and the local school authorities, but not large enough to carry the system on, and to weaken all these forces, by making the friends of education feel that the work is done for them without their own effort. Government shall be only a help to them, rather than a commander in the work of education.

In conclusion, I say that in the pending bill we disclaim any control over the educational system of the States. We only require reports of what they do with our bounty; and those reports, brought here and published for the information of the people, will spread abroad the light, and awaken the enthusiasm and emulation of our people. This policy is in harmony with the act of 1867 creating the Bureau of Education, and whose fruits have already been so abundant in good results. I hope that the House will set its seal of approval on our American system of education, and will adopt this mode of advancing and strengthening it.

II.

ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO ABOLISH SLAVERY.

In the House of Representatives, January 13, 1865.

THE House having under consideration the joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to abolish slavery—

Mr. Garfield said:

Mr. Speaker: We shall never know why slavery dies so hard in this Republic and in this hall till we know why sin has such longevity and Satan is immortal. With marvelous tenacity of existence, it has outlived the expectations of its friends and the hopes of its enemies. It has been declared here and elsewhere to be in all the several stages of mortality, wounded, moribund, dead. The question was raised by my colleague [Mr. Cox] yesterday, whether it was indeed dead, or only in a troubled sleep. I know of no better illustration of its condition than is found in Sallust's admirable history of the great conspirator Catiline, who, when his final battle was fought and lost, his army broken and scattered, was found far in advance of his own troops, lying among the dead enemies of Rome, yet breathing a little, but exhibiting in his countenance all that ferocity of spirit which had characterized his life. So, sir, this body of slavery lies before us among the dead enemies of the republic, mortally wounded, impotent in its fiendish wickedness, but with its old ferocity of look, bearing the unmistakable marks of its infernal origin.

Who does not remember that thirty years ago—a short period in the life of a nation—but little could be said with impunity in these halls on the subject of slavery? How well do gentlemen here remember the history of that distinguished predecessor of mine, Joshua R. Giddings, lately gone to his rest, who, with his forlorn hope of faithful men, took his life in his hand, and in the name of justice protested against the great crime, and who stood bravely in his place until his white locks, like the plume of Henry of Navarre, marked where the battle for freedom raged fiercest!

We can hardly realize that this is the same people, and these are the same halls, where now scarcely a man can be found who will venture to do more than falter out an apology for slavery, protesting in the same breath that he has no love for the dying tyrant. None, I believe, but that man of more than supernal boldness from the city of New York [Mr. Fernando Wood], has ventured this session to raise his voice in favor of slavery for its own sake. He still sees in its features the reflection of beauty and divinity, and only he. "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! How art thou cast down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!" Many mighty men have been slain by thee; many proud ones have humbled themselves at thy feet! All along the coast of our political sea these victims of slavery lie like stranded wrecks, broken on the headlands of freedom. How lately did its advocates, with impious boldness, maintain it as God's own, to be venerated and cherished as divine! It was another and higher form of civilization. It was the holy evangel of America dispensing its mercies to a benighted race, and destined to bear countless blessings to the wilderness of the West. In its mad arrogance it lifted its hand to strike down the fabric of the Union, and since that fatal day it has been a "fugitive and a vagabond upon the earth." Like the spirit that Jesus cast out, it has, since then, been "seeking rest and finding none."

It has sought in all the corners of the republic to find some hiding-place in which to shelter itself from the death it so richly deserves.

It sought an asylum in the untrodden territories of the West, but, with a whip of scorpions, indignant freemen drove it thence. I do not believe that a loyal man can now be found who would consent that it should again enter them. It has no hope of harbor there. It found no protection or favor in the hearts or consciences of the freemen of the republic, and has fled for its last hope of safety behind the shield of the Constitution. We propose to follow it there, and drive it thence as Satan was exiled from heaven. But now, in the hour of its mortal agony, in this hall it has found a defender.

My gallant colleague [Mr. Pendleton], for I recognize him as a gallant and able man, plants himself at the door of his darling, and bids defiance to all assailants. He has followed slavery in its flight, until at last it has reached the great temple where liberty is enshrined—the Constitution of the United States—and there, in that last retreat, declares that no hand shall strike it. It reminds me of that celebrated passage in the great Latin poet, in which the serpents of the sea, when they had destroyed Laocoon and his sons, fled to the heights of the Trojan citadel and coiled their slimy lengths around the feet of the tutelary goddess, and were covered by the orb of her shield. So, under the guidance of my colleague [Mr. Pendleton], slavery, gorged with the blood of ten thousand freemen, has climbed to the high citadel of American nationality, and coiled itself securely, as he believes, around the feet of the statue of Justice and under the shield of the Constitution of the United States. We desire to follow it even there, and kill it beside the very altar of Liberty. Its blood can never make atonement for the least of its crimes.

But the gentleman has gone further. He is not content that the snake sorceress shall be merely *under the protection* of the Constitution. In his view, by a strange metamorphosis, slavery becomes an invisible essence, and takes up its abode in the very grain and fiber of the Constitution; and when we would strike it he says, "I can not point out any express clause that prohibits you from destroying slavery; but I find a prohibition in the intent and meaning of the Constitution. I go under the surface, out of sight, into the very genius of it, and in that invisible domain slavery is enshrined, and there is no power in the republic to drive it thence." That I may do no injustice to my colleague, I will read from his speech of yesterday the passage to which I refer:

My colleague from the Toledo district [Mr. Ashley], in the speech which he made the other day, told us with reference to this point:

"If I read the Constitution aright, and understand the force of language, the section which I have just quoted is to-day free from all limitations and conditions save two, one of which pro-

vides that the suffrage of the several States in the Senate shall be equal, and that no State shall lose this equality by any amendment of the Constitution without its consent, the other relates to taxation. These are the only conditions and limitations."

I deny it. I assert that there is another limitation stronger even than the letter of the Constitution, and that is to be found in its intent and its spirit and its foundation idea. I put the question which has been put before in this debate: Can three fourths of the States constitutionally change this Government, and make it an autocracy? It is not prohibited by the letter of the Constitution.

It does not come within the two classes of limitations and conditions asserted by my colleague. Why is it that this change can not be made? I will tell you why. It is because republicanism lies at the very foundation of our system of government, and to overthrow that idea is not to amend, but to subvert, the Constitution of the United States; and I say that if three fourths of the States should undertake to pass an amendment of that kind, and Rhode Island alone dissented, she would have the right to resist by force. It would be her duty to resist by force; and her cause would be sacred in the eyes of just men, and sanctified in the eyes of a just God.

He goes behind the letter of the Constitution, and finds a refuge for slavery in its intent, and with that intent he declares we have no right to deal in the way of amendment.

But he has gone even deeper than the spirit and intent of the Constitution. He has announced a discovery to which I am sure no other statesman will lay claim. He has found a domain where slavery can no more be reached by human law than the life of Satan by the sword of Michael. He has marked the hither boundary of this newly discovered continent, in his response to the question of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Wilson]. I will read it:

I will not be drawn now into a discussion with the gentleman as to the origin of slavery, nor to the law which lies behind the Constitution of the United States, and behind the government of the States, by which these people are held to slavery.

Not finding anything in the words and

phrases of the Constitution that forbids an amendment abolishing slavery, he goes behind all human enactments, and far away, among the eternal equities, he finds a primal law which overshadows states, nations, and constitutions, as space envelops the universe, and by its solemn sanctions one human being can hold another in perpetual slavery. Surely, human ingenuity has never gone further to protect a malefactor or defend a crime. I shall make no argument with my colleague on this point, for in that high court to which he appeals eternal justice dwells with freedom, and slavery has never entered.

I now turn to the main point of his argument. He has given us the key to his theory of the Constitution in the three words which the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Jenckes] commented upon last evening. Upon those words rests the strength or weakness of his position. He describes the Constitution of the United States as a "*compact of confederation*."

If I understand the gentleman, he holds that each State is sovereign; that in their sovereign capacity, as the source and fountain of power, the States, each for itself, ratified the Constitution which the Convention had framed. What powers they did not grant, they reserved. They did not grant to the Federal Government the right to control the subject of slavery. That right still resides in the States severally. Hence no amendment of the Constitution by three fourths of the States can legally affect slavery in the remaining fourth. Hence no amendment by the modes pointed out in the Constitution can reach it. This, I believe, is a succinct and just statement of his argument. The whole question turns upon the sovereignty of the States. Are they sovereign and independent now? Were they ever so? I shall endeavor to answer.

I appeal to the facts of history, and to bring them clearly before us I affirm:

I. That prior to the 4th day of July, 1776, these colonies were neither free nor independent. Their sovereignty was lodged in the crown of Great Britain. I believe no man will deny this. It was admitted in the first Declaration of Rights, put forth by the Revolutionary Congress that assembled in

Philadelphia, in 1774, to pray for a redress of grievances. That body expressly admitted that the sovereignty of the colonies was lodged in the crown of Great Britain.

II. On the 4th of July, 1776, the sovereignty was withdrawn from the British crown by the whole people of the colonies, and lodged in the Revolutionary Congress. No colony declared itself free and independent. Neither Virginia, New York, nor Massachusetts declared itself free and independent of the crown of Great Britain. The declaration was made, not even by all the colonies *as colonies*, but in the name and by the authority of "the good people of the colonies," as one people.

In the following memorable declaration the sovereignty was transferred from the crown of Great Britain to the *people of the colonies*:

We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown, and that all political connections between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved; and that as free and independent States they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do.

In vindication of this view I read from the 197th page of the first volume of Justice Story's "Commentaries":

The colonies did not severally act for themselves and proclaim their own independence. It is true that some of the States had previously formed incipient governments for themselves, but it was done in compliance with the recommendations of Congress. . . .

The declaration of the independence of all the colonies was the united act of all. It was a "declaration by the representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled," "by the delegates appointed by the good people of the colonies," as in a prior declaration of rights they were called. It was not in an act done by the State governments then organized, nor by persons chosen by them. It was emphati-

cally the act of the whole *people* of the United States, by the instrumentality of their representatives, chosen for that, among other purposes. It was an act not competent to the State governments, or any of them, as organized under the charters, to adopt. Those charters neither contemplated the case nor provided for it. It was an act of original inherent sovereignty by the people themselves, resulting from their right to change the form of government, and to institute a new government whenever necessary for their safety and happiness. So the Declaration of Independence treats it. No State had presumed of itself to form a new government, or to provide for the exigencies of the times, without consulting Congress on the subject; and when they acted, it was in pursuance of the recommendation of Congress. It was, therefore, the achievement of the whole for the benefit of the whole.

The people of the United Colonies made the United Colonies free and independent States, and absolved them from all allegiance to the British crown. The Declaration of Independence has accordingly always been treated as an act of paramount and sovereign authority, complete and perfect, *per se* and *ipso facto* working an entire dissolution of all political connections with or allegiance to Great Britain. And this, not merely as a practical fact, but in a legal and constitutional view of the matter by courts of justice.

When these people of the colonies became free, having withdrawn the sovereignty from the crown of Great Britain, where did they lodge it? Not in the States; but so far as they delegated it at all, they lodged it in the Revolutionary Congress then sitting in Philadelphia. My colleague dissents. I ask his attention again to the language of this distinguished commentator, on page 200 of the same volume:

In the next place, we have seen that the power to do this act was not derived from the State governments, nor was it done generally with their cooperation. The question then naturally presents itself, if it is to be considered as a national act, in what manner did the colonies become a nation, and in what manner did Congress become possessed of this national power? The true answer must be that as soon as Congress assumed powers and passed measures which were in their nature national, to that extent the people from whose acquiescence and consent they took effect must be considered as agreeing to form a nation.

Mr. PENDLETON: I desire to ask my colleague from what power the delegates who

sat in that Congress derived their authority to make the declaration; whether they did not derive it from the colonies, or the States if the gentleman prefers that word, and whether each delegate did not speak in the Congress for the State government which authorized him to speak there?

Mr. GARFIELD: I say, in answer to the point the gentleman makes, as I have already said, and in the language of this distinguished commentator, that the moment the Revolutionary Congress assumed national prerogatives, and the people, by their silence, consented, that moment the people of the colonies were constituted a Nation, and that Revolutionary Congress became the authorized Government of the Nation. But the declaration was made "by the authority of the good people," and hence it was *their* declaration.

Mr. PENDLETON: Will the gentleman permit me to ask him whether, from that moment, they became the representatives of the Nation, or whether they still retained their position as representatives of the States?

Mr. GARFIELD: They were both. They were still representatives of the States; but the new function of national representatives was added. They then took upon them that which now belongs to the gentleman, the twofold quality of State citizenship and national citizenship. The gentleman is twice a citizen, subject to two jurisdictions; and so were they.

I shall still further fortify my position by reading from the 203d page of the same volume:

From the moment of the Declaration of Independence, if not for most purposes at an antecedent period, the united colonies must be considered as being a nation *de facto*, having a General Government over it, created and acting by the general consent of the people of all the colonies. The powers of that Government were not, and indeed could not be, well defined. But still its exclusive sovereignty in many cases was firmly established, and its controlling power over the States was in most, if not all, national measures universally admitted.

III. On the 1st day of March, 1781, the sovereignty of the new Nation was lodged, by the people, in the "Articles of Confederation." The Government thus formed

was a Confederacy. Its Constitution might properly be styled a "Compact of Confederation," though by its terms it established a "perpetual union," and left small ground for the doctrine of secession.

IV. On the 21st day of June, 1788, our national sovereignty was lodged, by the people, in the Constitution of the United States, where it still resides, and for its preservation our armies are to-day in the field. In all these stages of development, from colonial dependence to full-orbed nationality, the people, not the States, have been omnipotent. *They* have abolished, established, altered, and amended, as suited their sovereign pleasure.

For the greater security of liberty, they chose to distribute the functions of government. They left to each State the regulation of its local and municipal affairs, and endowed the Federal Republic with the high functions of national sovereignty. *They* made the Constitution. That great charter tells its own story best.

We, *the people* of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Not "we, the sovereign States," do enter into a league or form a "*compact of confederation*."

If the gentleman looks, then, for a kind of political "apostolic succession" of American sovereignty, he will find that neither colonies nor States were in the royal line; but this is the genealogy: first, the Crown and Parliament of Great Britain; second, the Revolutionary Congress; third, the Articles of Confederation; fourth and now, the Constitution of the United States; and all this by the authority of the people.

Now, if no one of the colonies was sovereign and independent, when and how did any of the States become so? The gentleman must show us by what act it was done, and where the deed was recorded. I think I have shown that his position has no foundation in history, and the argument based upon it falls to the ground.

In framing and establishing the Constitution, what restrictions were laid upon the people? Absolutely no human power beyond themselves. No barriers confined them but the laws of nature, the laws of God, their love of justice, and their aspirations for liberty. Over that limitless expanse they ranged at will, and out of such materials as their wisdom selected they built the stately fabric of our Government. That Constitution, with its amendments, is the latest and the greatest utterance of American sovereignty. The hour is now at hand when that majestic sovereign, for the benignant purpose of securing still further the "blessings of liberty," is about to put forth another oracle; is about to declare that universal freedom shall be the supreme law of the land. Show me the power that is authorized to forbid it.

The lapse of eighty years has not abated one jot or tittle from the original sovereignty of the American people. They made the Constitution what it is. They could have made it otherwise then; they can make it otherwise now.

But my colleague [Mr. Pendleton] has planted himself on the intent of the Constitution. On that point I ask him by what means the will of this Nation reaches the citizen with its obligations? Only as that will is revealed in the logical and grammatical meaning of the words and phrases of the written Constitution. Beyond this there is, there can be, no legal force or potency. If the amending power granted in the Constitution be in any way abridged or restricted, such restriction must be found in the just meaning of the instrument itself. Any other doctrine would overthrow the whole fabric of jurisprudence. What are the limitations of the amending power? Plainly and only these:

That no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.—*Article V.*

The first restriction, being bounded by the year 1808, is of course *functus officio*, and no longer operative; the last is still binding.

The gentleman [Mr. Pendleton] does not claim that any other sentence is restrictive; but he would have us believe there is something not written down, a *tertium quid*, a kind of exhalation rising out of the depths of the Constitution, that has the power of itself to stay the hand of the people of this great Republic in their attempt to put away an evil that is deleterious to the Nation's life. He would lead us in pursuit of these intangible shadows, would place us in the dominion of vague, invisible powers that exhale like odors from the Constitution, but are more potent than the Constitution itself. Such an *ignis fatuus* I am not disposed to follow, especially when it leads to a hopeful future for human slavery.

I can not agree with my colleague, and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boutwell], who unite in declaring that no amendment to the Constitution can be made which would be in conflict with its objects as declared in the preamble. What special immunity was granted to that first paragraph? Could not our forefathers have adopted a different preamble in the beginning? Could they not have employed other words and declared other objects as the basis of their Constitution? If they could have made a different preamble, declaring other and different objects, so can we now declare other objects in our amendments. The preamble is itself amendable just as is every clause of the Constitution, excepting only the ones already referred to.

But this point is not necessary in the case we are now considering. We need no change of the preamble to enable us to abolish slavery. It is only by the final overthrow of slavery that the objects of the preamble can be fully realized. By that means alone can we "*establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.*"

The gentleman [Mr. Pendleton] puts another case which I wish to notice. He says that nine of the thirteen original colonies adopted the Constitution, and by its very terms it was binding only on the nine. So if three fourths of the States should pass this amendment, it would not bind the other fourth.

In commenting upon this clause, Judge

Tucker of Virginia, in his appendix to Blackstone, says that if the four colonies had not adopted the Constitution they would have been a foreign people. The writers of "The Federalist" hold a different doctrine, and fall back upon the original right of the nation to preserve itself, and say that the nine States would have had the right to compel the other four to come in. But the question is unimportant from the fact that they did come in and adopt the Constitution. The contract once ratified, and obligations once taken, they became an integral part of an indivisible nation, as indivisible as a State.

The argument is irrelevant; for the mode of adopting the Constitution is one thing; the mode pointed out in the Constitution for adopting amendments to it is quite another. The two have no necessary relation to each other.

I therefore agree with my colleague from the Columbus district [Mr. Cox], that except in the two cases of limitation, two thirds of Congress and three fourths of the States can do anything in the way of amendment, being bound only by their sense of duty to God and the country. The field is then fully open before us.

On the justice of the amendment itself no arguments are necessary. The reasons crowd in on every side. To enumerate them would be a work of superfluity. To me it is a matter of great surprise that gentlemen on the other side should wish to delay the death of slavery. I can only account for it on the ground of long-continued familiarity and friendship. I should be glad to hear them say of slavery, their beloved, as did the jealous Moor:

"Yet she must die, else she'll betray more men."

Has she not betrayed and slain men enough? Are they not strewn over a thousand battle-fields? Is not this Moloch already gorged with the bloody feast? Its best friends know that its final hour is fast approaching. The avenging gods are on its track. Their feet are not now, as of old, shod with wool, for slow and stately stepping, but winged like Mercury's to bear the swift message of vengeance. No human power can avert the final catastrophe.

I did not intend, Mr. Speaker, ever again

to address the House on the subject of slavery. I had hoped we might, without a struggle, at once and for ever remove it from the theatre of American politics, and turn our thoughts to those other and larger fields now opening before us. But when I saw the bold and determined efforts put forth in this House yesterday for its preservation, I could not resist my inclination to strike one blow, in the hope of hastening its doom.

III.

THE REVIVED DOCTRINE OF STATE SOVEREIGNTY.

In the House of Representatives, June 27, 1879.

THE House being in Committee of the Whole on the Marshals Appropriation Bill, Mr. Garfield said:

Mr. Chairman: "To this favor" it has come at last. The great fleet that set out on the 18th of March, with all its freightage and armament, is so shattered that now all the valuables it carried are embarked in this little craft, to meet whatever fate the sea and the storm may offer. This little bill contains the residuum of almost everything that has been the subject of controversy at the present session. I will not discuss it in detail, but will speak only of its central feature, and especially of the opinions which the discussion of that feature has brought to the surface during the present session. The majority in this Congress have adopted what I consider very extreme and dangerous opinions on certain important constitutional questions. They have not only drifted back to their old attitude on the subject of State sovereignty, but they have pushed that doctrine much further than most of their predecessors ever went before, except during the period immediately preceding the late war.

So extreme are some of these utterances, that nothing short of actual quotations from the record will do their authors justice. I therefore shall read several extracts from debates at the present session of Congress, and group them in the order of the topics discussed.

Senator Wallace ("Congressional Record," June 3d, pp. 3 and 5) says:

The Federal Government has no voters; it can make none, it can constitutionally control none. . . . When it asserts the power to create and hold "*national elections*," or to regulate the conduct of the voter *on election day*, or to maintain *equal suffrage*, it tramples under foot the very basis of the Federal system, and seeks to build a consolidated government from a democratic republic. This is the plain purpose of the men now in control of the Federal Government, and to this end the teachings of leading Republicans now are shaped.

There are no national voters. Voters who vote for national representatives are qualified by State constitutions and State laws, and national citizenship is not required of a voter of the State by any provision of the Federal Constitution nor in practice.

If there be such a thing, then, as a "national election," it wants the first element of an election—a national voter. The Federal Government, or (if it suits our friends on the other side better) the Nation, has no voters. It can not create them, it can not qualify them.

Representative Clark, of Missouri ("Record," April 26th, p. 60), says:

The United States has no voters.

Senator Maxey, Texas ("Record," April 21st, p. 72), says:

It follows as surely as "grass grows and water runs" that, under our Constitution, the entire control of elections must be under the State whose voters assemble; whose right to vote is not drawn from the Constitution of the United States, but existed and was freely exercised long before its adoption.

Senator Williams, Kentucky ("Record," April 25th, p. 8), says:

The Legislatures of the States and the people of the several districts are the constituency of Senators and Representatives in Congress. They receive their commissions from the Governor, and when they resign (which is very seldom) they send their resignations to the Governor, and not to the President. They are State officers, and not Federal officers.

Senator Whyte ("Record," May 21st, p. 14) says:

There are no elections of United States officers and no voters of the United States. The voters are voters of the States, they are the people of the States, and their members of the House of

Representatives are chosen by the electors of the States to represent the people of the States, whose agents they are.

Mr. McLANE: Do I understand him to say that the Government of the United States has the right to keep the peace anywhere within a State? Do I understand him to say that there is any "peace of the United States" at all recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. ROBESON: Certainly I do.—("Record," April 4th, p. 14)

Mr. McLane ("Record," April 4th, p. 15) says:

I believe that the provision of law which we are about to repeal is unconstitutional; that is to say, that it is unconstitutional for the United States to "keep the peace" anywhere in the States, either at the polls or elsewhere, and if it were constitutional, I believe, in common with gentlemen on this side of the House, that it would be highly inexpedient to exercise that power. . . .

When that law used the phrase "to keep the peace," it could only mean the peace of the States. . . .

It is not a possible thing to have a breach of the United States peace at the polls.

Senator Whyte ("Record," May 21st, p. 18) says:

Sovereignty is lodged with the States, where it had its home long before the Constitution was created. The Constitution is the creature of that sovereignty. The Federal Government has no inherent sovereignty. All its sovereign powers are drawn from the States.

The States were in existence long before the Union, and the latter took its birth from their power.

The State governments are supreme, by inherent power originally conceded to them by the people, as to the control of local legislation and administration. The Federal Government has no part or lot in this vast mass of inherent sovereign power, and its interference therewith is utterly unwarrantable.

Senator Wallace ("Record," June 3d, pp. 3 and 4) says:

Thus we have every branch of the Federal Government, House, Senate, the Executive and Judiciary Departments, standing upon the State governments, and all resting finally upon the people of the States, qualified as voters by State Constitutions and State laws.

Senator Whyte ("Record," May 21st, p. 15) says:

No, Mr. President; it never was declared that we were a Nation.

In the formation and adoption of the Constitution the States were the factors.

These are the declarations of seven distinguished members of the present Congress. The doctrines set forth in the above quotations may be fairly regarded as the doctrines of the Democracy as represented in this Capitol.

Let me summarize them. First, there are no national elections; second, the United States has no voters; third, the States have the exclusive right to control all elections of members of Congress; fourth, the Senators and Representatives in Congress are State officers, or, as they have been called during the present session, "ambassadors" or "agents" of the State; fifth, the United States has no authority to keep the peace anywhere within a State, and, in fact, has no peace to keep; sixth, the United States is not a Nation endowed with sovereign power, but is a confederacy of States; seventh, the States are sovereignties possessing inherent supreme powers, they are older than the Union, and as independent sovereignties the State governments created the Union and determined and limited the powers of the General Government.

These declarations embody the sum total of the constitutional doctrines which the Democracy has avowed during this extra session of Congress. They form a body of doctrines which I do not hesitate to say are more extreme than was ever before held on this subject, except, perhaps, at the very crisis of secession and rebellion.

And they have not been put forth as abstract theories of government. True to the logic of their convictions, the majority have sought to put them in practice by affirmative acts of legislation.

Let me enumerate these attempts. First, they have denounced as unconstitutional all attempts of the United States to supervise, regulate, or protect national elections, and have tried to repeal all laws on the national statute-book enacted for that purpose. Sec-

ond, following the advice given by Calhoun in his political testament to his party, they have tried to repeal all those portions of the venerated Judiciary Act of 1789, the Act of 1833 against nullification, the Act of 1861, and the acts amendatory thereof, which provide for carrying to the Supreme Court of the United States all controversies that relate to the duties and authority of any officer acting under the Constitution and laws of the United States. Third, they have attempted to prevent the President from enforcing the laws of the Union, by refusing necessary supplies, and by forbidding the use of the army to suppress violent resistance to the laws, by which, if they had succeeded, they would have left the citizens and the authorities of the States free to obey or disobey the laws of the Union as they might choose.

This, I believe, Mr. Chairman, is a fair summary both of the principles and the attempted practice to which the majority of this House has treated the country during the extra session.

Before quitting this topic, it is worth while to notice the fact that the attempt made in one of the bills now pending in this House, to curtail the jurisdiction of the national courts, is in the direct line of the teachings of John C. Calhoun. In his "Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United States," published by authority of the Legislature of South Carolina in 1851, he sets forth at great length the doctrine that ours is not a National Government, but a confederacy of sovereign States, and then proceeds to point out what he considers the dangerous departures which the Government has made from his theory of the Constitution.

The first and most dangerous of these departures he declares to be the adoption of the twenty-fifth section of the Judiciary Act of 1789, by which appeals were authorized from the judgments of the supreme courts of the States to the Supreme Court of the United States. He declares that section of the act unconstitutional, because it makes the supreme court of a "sovereign" State subordinate to the judicial power of the United States; and he recommends his followers never to rest until they have repealed, not

only that section, but also what he calls the still more dangerous law of 1833, which forbids the courts of the States to sit in judgment on the acts of an officer of the United States done in pursuance of national law. The present Congress has won the unenviable distinction of making the first attempt, since the death of Calhoun, to revive and put in practice his disorganizing and destructive theory of government.

Firmly believing that these doctrines and attempted practice of the present Congress are erroneous and pernicious, I will state briefly the counter-propositions:

I affirm: first, that the Constitution of the United States was not created by the governments of the States, but was ordained and established by the only sovereign in this country—the common superior of both the States and the Nation—the people themselves; second, that the United States is a Nation, having a Government whose powers, as defined and limited by the Constitution, operate upon all the States in their corporate capacity and upon all the people; third, that by its legislative, executive, and judicial authority the Nation is armed with adequate power to enforce all the provisions of the Constitution against all opposition of individuals or of States, at all times and all places within the Union.

These are broad propositions; and I take the few minutes remaining to defend them. The constitutional history of this country, or, rather, the history of sovereignty and government in this country, is comprised in four sharply defined epochs:

First. Prior to the 4th day of July, 1776, sovereignty, so far as it can be affirmed of this country, was lodged in the crown of Great Britain. Every member of every colony (the colonists were not citizens, but subjects) drew his legal rights from the crown of Great Britain. "Every acre of land in this country was then held mediately or immediately by grants from that crown," and "all the civil authority then existing or exercised here flowed from the head of the British empire."

Second. On the 4th day of July, 1776, the people of these colonies, asserting their natural inherent right as sovereigns, with-

drew the sovereignty from the crown of Great Britain, and reserved it to themselves. In so far as they delegated this national authority at all, they delegated it to the Continental Congress assembled at Philadelphia. That Congress by general consent became the supreme Government of this country—executive, judicial, and legislative in one. During the whole of its existence it wielded the supreme power of the new Nation.

Third. On the 1st day of March, 1781, the same sovereign power, the people, withdrew the authority from the Continental Congress, and lodged it, so far as they lodged it at all, with the Confederation, which, though a league of States, was declared to be a perpetual union.

Fourth. When at last our fathers found the Confederation too weak and inefficient for the purposes of a great nation, they abolished it, and lodged the national authority, enlarged and strengthened by new powers, in the Constitution of the United States, where, in spite of all assaults, it still remains. All these great acts were done by the only sovereign in this Republic, the people themselves.

That no one may charge that I pervert history to sustain my own theories, I call attention to the fact that not one of the colonies declared itself free and independent. Neither Virginia nor Massachusetts threw off its allegiance to the British crown as a colony. The great declaration was made not even by all the colonies as colonies, but it was made in the name and by authority of "all the good people of the colonies" as one people.

Let me fortify this position by a great name that will shine for ever in the constellation of our Southern sky—the name of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney of South Carolina. He was a leading member of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, and also a member of the Convention of South Carolina which ratified the Constitution. In this latter Convention the doctrine of State sovereignty found a few champions; and their attempt to prevent the adoption of the Constitution, because it established a supreme National Government, was rebuked by him in these memorable words. I quote from his speech as recorded in Elliott's "Debates":

This admirable manifesto, which, for importance of matter and elegance of composition, stands unrivaled, sufficiently confutes the honorable gentleman's doctrine of the individual sovereignty and independence of the several States. In that declaration the several States are not even enumerated, but after reciting, in nervous language, and with convincing arguments, our right to independence, and the tyranny which compelled us to assert it, the declaration is made in the following words. "We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do in the name, and by the authority, of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States."

The separate independence and individual sovereignty of the several States were never thought of by the enlightened band of patriots who framed this declaration. The several States are not even mentioned by name in any part of it, as if it was intended to impress this maxim on America, that our freedom and independence arose from our union, and that without it we could neither be free nor independent. Let us, then, consider all attempts to weaken this union by maintaining that each is separately and individually independent as a species of political heresy, which can never benefit us, but may bring on us the most serious distresses.

For a further and equally powerful vindication of the same view, I refer to the "Commentaries" of Justice Story, vol. i, p. 197.

In this same connection, and as a pertinent and effective response to the Democratic doctrines under review, I quote from the first Annual Message of Abraham Lincoln, than whom no man of our generation studied the origin of the Union more profoundly. He said:

Our States have neither more nor less power than that reserved to them in the Union by the Constitution, no one of them ever having been a State *out* of the Union. The original ones passed into the Union even *before* they cast off their British colonial dependence, and the new ones each came into the Union directly from a condition of dependence, excepting Texas. And even Texas, in its temporary independence, was never designated a State. The new ones only took the designation of States on coming into the Union, while that name was first adopted for the old ones

by the Declaration of Independence. Therein the "united colonies" were declared to be "free and independent States"; but, even then, the object plainly was not to declare their independence of *one another*, or of the *Union*, but directly the contrary, as their mutual pledge and their mutual action before, at the time, and afterward abundantly show. . . .

The States have their status in the Union, and they have no other legal status. If they break from this, they can only do so against law and by revolution. The Union, and not themselves separately, procured their independence and their liberty. By conquest or purchase, the Union gave each of them whatever of independence and liberty it has. The Union is older than any of the States, and in fact it created them as States. Originally some dependent colonies made the Union, and in turn the Union threw off their old dependence for them and made them States, such as they are. Not one of them ever had a State Constitution independent of the Union. Of course it is not forgotten that all the new States framed their Constitutions before they entered the Union; nevertheless dependent upon and preparatory to coming into the Union

In further enforcement of the doctrine that the State Governments were not the sovereigns who created this Government, I refer to the great decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Chisholm vs. The State of Georgia*, reported in 2 Dallas, a decision replete with the most enlightened national spirit, in which the Court stamps with its indignant condemnation the notion that the State of Georgia was "sovereign" in any sense that made it independent of or superior to the Nation.

Mr. Justice Wilson said:

As a judge of this Court I know, and can decide upon the knowledge, that the citizens of Georgia, when they acted upon the large scale of the Union as a part of the "people of the United States," did not surrender the supreme or sovereign power to that State; but, as to the purposes of the Union, retained it to themselves. As to the purposes of the Union, therefore, Georgia is not a sovereign State. . . .

Whoever considers in a combined and comprehensive view the general texture of the Constitution will be satisfied that the people of the United States intended to form themselves into a nation for national purposes. They instituted for such purposes a National Government, com-

plete in all its parts, with powers legislative, executive, and judiciary, and in all those powers extending over the whole nation. Is it congruous that, with regard to such purposes, any man or body of men, any person, natural or artificial, should be permitted to claim successfully an entire exemption from the jurisdiction of the National Government?

Mr. Chairman, the dogma of State sovereignty, which has reawakened to such vigorous life in this chamber, has borne such bitter fruits and entailed such suffering upon our people that it deserves more particular notice. It should be noticed that the word "sovereignty" can not be fitly applied to any government in this country. It is not found in our Constitution. It is a feudal word, born of the despotism of the Middle Ages, and was unknown even in imperial Rome. A "sovereign" is a person, a prince, who has subjects that owe him allegiance. There is no one paramount sovereign in the United States. There is no person here who holds any title or authority whatever, except the official authority given him by law. Americans are not subjects, but citizens. Our only sovereign is the whole people. To talk about the "inherent sovereignty" of a corporation—an artificial person—is to talk nonsense; and we ought to reform our habit of speech on that subject.

But what do gentlemen mean when they tell us that a State is sovereign? What does sovereignty mean in its accepted use, but a political corporation having no superior? Is a State of this Union such a corporation? Let us test it by a few examples drawn from the Constitution. No State of this Union can make war or conclude a peace. Without the consent of Congress it can not raise or support an army or a navy. It can not make a treaty with a foreign power, nor enter into any agreement or compact with another State. It can not levy imposts or duties on imports or exports. It can not coin money. It can not regulate commerce. It can not authorize a single ship to go into commission anywhere on the high seas; if it should, that ship would be seized as a pirate or confiscated by the laws of the United States. A State can not emit bills of credit. It can enact no law which makes anything but gold and silver a legal tender.

It has no flag except the flag of the Union. And there are many other subjects on which the States are forbidden by the Constitution to legislate.

How much inherent sovereignty is left in a corporation which is thus shorn of all these great attributes of sovereignty?

But this is not all. The Supreme Court of the United States may declare null and void any law or any clause of the Constitution of a State which happens to be in conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States. Again, the States appear as plaintiffs and defendants before the Supreme Court of the United States. They may sue each other; and, until the Eleventh Amendment was adopted, a citizen might sue a State. These "sovereigns" may all be summoned before their common superior to be judged. And yet they are endowed with supreme inherent sovereignty!

Again, the government of a State may be absolutely abolished by Congress, in case it is not republican in form. And, finally, to cap the climax of this absurd pretension, every right possessed by one of these "sovereign" States, every inherent sovereign right, except the single right to equal representation in the Senate, may be taken away, without its consent, by the vote of two thirds of Congress and three fourths of the States. But, in spite of all these disabilities, we hear them paraded as independent, sovereign States, the creators of the Union and the dictators of its powers. How inherently "sovereign" must be that State west of the Mississippi which the Nation bought and paid for with the public money, and permitted to come into the Union a half century after the Constitution was adopted! And yet we are told that the States are inherently sovereign and created the National Government.

Read a long line of luminous decisions of the Supreme Court. Take the life of Chief-Justice Marshall, that great judge, who found the Constitution paper and made it a power, who found it a skeleton and clothed it with flesh and blood. By his wisdom and genius he made it the potent and beneficent instrument for the government of a great nation. Everywhere he repelled the insidious and dangerous heresy of the sovereign-

ty of the States in the sense in which it has been used in these debates.

Half a century ago this heresy threatened the stability of the Nation. The eloquence of Webster and his compeers and the patriotism and high courage of Andrew Jackson resisted and for a time destroyed its power; but it continued to live as the evil genius, the incarnate devil, of America; and in 1861 it was the fatal phantom that lured eleven millions of our people into rebellion against their Government. Hundreds of thousands of those who took up arms against the Union stubbornly resisted all inducements to that fatal step until they were summoned by the authority of their States.

The dogma of State sovereignty in alliance with chattel slavery finally made its appeal to that court of last resort where the laws are silent, and where kings and nations appear in arms for judgment. In that awful court of war two questions were tried: Shall slavery live? And is a State so sovereign that it may nullify the laws and destroy the Union? Those two questions were tried on the thousand battle-fields of the war; and if war ever "legislates," as a leading Democrat of Ohio once wisely affirmed, then our war legislated finally upon those subjects, and determined, beyond all controversy, that slavery should never again live in this Republic, and that there is not sovereignty enough in any State to authorize its people either to destroy the Union or nullify its laws.

I am unwilling to believe that any considerable number of Americans will ever again push that doctrine to the same extreme; and yet, in these summer months of 1879, in the Congress of the reunited Nation, we find the majority drifting fast and far in the wrong direction, by reasserting much of that doctrine which the war ought to have settled for ever. And what is more lamentable, such declarations as those which I read at the outset are finding their echoes in many portions of the country which were lately the theatre of war. No one can read the proceedings at certain recent celebrations, without observing the growing determination to assert that the men who fought against the Union were not engaged in treasonable conspiracy against the Nation, but that they did

right to fight for their States, and that, in the long run, the lost cause will be victorious. These indications are filling the people with anxiety and indignation; and they are beginning to inquire whether the war has really settled these great questions.

I remind gentlemen on the other side that we have not ourselves revived these issues. We had hoped they were settled beyond recall, and that peace and friendship might be fully restored to our people.

But the truth requires me to say that there is one indispensable ground of agreement on which alone we can stand together, and it is this: The war for the Union was right, everlastingly right; and the war against the Union was wrong, for ever wrong. However honest and sincere individuals may have been, the secession was none the less rebellion and treason. We defend the States in the exercise of their many and important rights, and we defend with equal zeal the rights of the United States. The rights and authority of both were received from the people—the only source of inherent power.

We insist not only that this is a Nation, but that the power of the Government, within its own prescribed sphere, operates directly upon the States and upon all the people. We insist that our laws shall be construed by our own courts and enforced by our Executive. Any theory which is inconsistent with this doctrine we will resist to the end.

Applying these reflections to the subject of national elections embraced in this bill, I remind gentlemen that this is a National House of Representatives. The people of my Congressional district have a right to know that a man elected in New York city is elected honestly and lawfully; for he joins in making laws for forty-five millions of people. Every citizen of the United States has an interest and a right in every election within the republic where national representatives are chosen. We insist that these laws relating to our national elections shall be enforced, not nullified; shall remain on the statute-books, and not be repealed; and that the just and legal supervision of these elections ought never again to be surrendered by the Government of the United

States. By our consent it never shall be surrendered.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill is about to be launched upon its stormy passage. It goes not into unknown waters; for its fellows have been wrecked in the same sea. Its short, disastrous, and, I may add, ignoble voyage is likely to be straight to the bottom.

In reply to Mr. Hurd, same day, Mr. Garfield said:

Mr. Chairman: Two points were made by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. Hurd], to which I desire to call attention. To strengthen his position, that the United States has no voters, he has quoted, as other gentlemen have quoted, the case of *Minor vs. Happersett*, 21 Wallace, page 170.

The question before the Court in that case was, whether a provision in the State Constitution which confines the right of voting to *male* citizens of the United States is a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution. The Court decided that it was not; and, in delivering his opinion, the Chief Justice took occasion to say that "the United States has no voters in the States, of its own creation." Now, all the gentlemen on the other side who have quoted this decision, have left out the words "*of its own creation*," which makes a very essential difference. The Constitution of the United States declares who shall vote for members of Congress, and it adopts the great body of voters whose qualifications may be or have been prescribed by the laws of the States. The power of *adoption* is no less a great governmental power than the power of *creation*.

But the second point to which I wish to refer, and which has been made by several gentlemen, and very markedly by my colleague [Mr. Hurd], is this: He says that the contemporaneous construction of that clause of the Constitution which provides that Congress may at any time make or alter the regulations in regard to the time, place, and manner of holding elections, has determined that Congress can never exercise that right so long as the States make provisions for it. So long as the States do not neglect or refuse to act, or are not prevented by re-

bellion or war from acting, it was their exclusive right to control the subject. That is what my colleague says. That is what is said in "The Record" of June 3d by a distinguished member of the Senate.

"Now, mark how plain a tale shall put that down."

On the 21st day of August, 1789, in the first House of Representatives that ever met, Mr. Burke, a member from South Carolina, offered the following as one of the amendments to the Constitution. I will read it:

The Congress shall not alter, modify, or interfere in the times, places, or manner of holding elections of Senators or Representatives, except when any State shall refuse or neglect, or be unable by invasion or rebellion, to make such elections.

That was the very proposition which my colleague says is the meaning of the Constitution as it now stands. This amendment was offered in a House of Representatives nearly one half of whose membership was made up of men who were in the Convention that framed the Constitution. That amendment was debated; and I hold in my hand the brief record of the debate. Fisher Ames of Massachusetts, approving of the clause as it now stands, said:

He thought this one of the most justifiable of all the powers of Congress. It was essential to a body representing the whole community that they should have power to regulate their own elections, in order to secure a representation from every part, and prevent any improper regulations, calculated to answer party purposes only. It is a solecism in politics to let others judge for them, and is a departure from the principles upon which the Constitution was founded. . . . He thought no Legislature was without the power to determine the mode of its own appointment; . . . that such an amendment as was now proposed would alter the Constitution; it would vest the supreme authority in places where it was never contemplated.

Mr. Madison was willing to make every amendment that was required by the States which did not tend to destroy the principles and efficacy of the Constitution; he conceived that the proposed amendment would have that tendency; he was therefore opposed to it.

Mr. Sherman observed that the Convention was very unanimous in passing this clause; that

it was an important provision, and if it was resigned it would tend to subvert the Government.

Mr. Goodhue hoped the amendment never would obtain. . . . Now, rather than this amendment should take effect, he would vote against all that had been agreed to. His greatest apprehensions were that the State Governments would oppose and thwart the general one to such a degree as finally to overturn it. Now, to guard against this evil, he wished the Federal Government to possess every power necessary to its existence.

After a full debate, in which the doctrine of State Rights was completely overwhelmed so far as this subject was concerned, the vote was taken, and 23 voted in favor of the amendment and 28 voted against it. It did not get even a majority, much less a two-thirds vote, in the House; and it never was called up in the Senate at all.

Now, who were the men that voted against it? Let me read some of their honored names: Fisher Ames of Massachusetts; Charles Carroll of Carrollton; Clymer of Pennsylvania, whose distinguished descendant is a member of this House; Fitzsimons of Pennsylvania; Muhlenberg of Pennsylvania, who was Speaker of the first House of Representatives; Lee and Madison of Virginia; Trumbull and Sherman of Connecticut—all these great names are recorded against the very construction of the Constitution which my colleague defends as the correct interpretation of the existing clause on that subject. That is all I desire to say.

IV.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

From a Speech made in the House of Representatives, March 14, 1870.

I concur in the expression of my friend from Indiana [Mr. Niblack] that the Republican party must stand by its own conduct, and I desire to call the attention of the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. Dawes] to a measure of economy and reform to which he may, with great propriety, direct his efforts, and in which I have no doubt he will have the hearty coopera-

tion of the President and the executive departments, and the gratitude of all good men. I refer to our civil service. I shall not now enter that broad field which my distinguished friend from Rhode Island [Mr. Jenckes] has occupied, but I call attention to the fact that our whole civil service is costing us far too much. Secretary McCulloch once made this remarkable statement:

If you will give me one half what it costs to run the Treasury Department of the United States, I will do all its work better than it is now done, and make a great fortune out of what I can save.

The same might be said of all our executive departments. And if there is one thing to which my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. Dawes] can devote his attention with most marked results, with the applause of this House and of New Hampshire and of the whole country, it is the reorganization of these departments.

In the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior there is a passage which should be commended to every member of this House. That officer says that he can do the work of his department with two thirds of the force which he now has under his control, if you will only give him a reasonable and wise organization. I quote his words:

The first measure of reform is to raise the standard of qualification, make merit as tested by the duty performed the sole ground of promotion, and secure to the faithful incumbent the same permanence of employment that is given to officers of the army and navy. Under the present system the general conviction among the clerks and employees is that the retention of their places depends much more upon the political influence they can command than upon energy or zeal in the performance of duty. After a careful examination of the subject, I am fully persuaded that the measure I have suggested would have enabled this department to do the work of the past fiscal year with a corps of clerks one third less in number than were found necessary.

I believe I am right in saying that one half of all that great army of clerks employed in the civil departments are engaged in the mere business of copying; not in the use of judgment or expert knowledge of business, nor the application of the law to

the adjustment of accounts; but to the mere manual labor of copying, filing, or counting.

Now, to do just such work as this, men can be hired all over the country for six or eight hundred dollars a year. Every business man knows that he can get a good, efficient copying clerk at that rate. But, without any rational organization, we are paying that whole class of employees at least double what they can get elsewhere. The whole business of civil appointments depends upon that vague, uncertain, intangible thing called political influence.

Take the messenger service in these various departments. I saw a man in one of the departments this morning whose whole business is to sit at a door and open it when people come in and shut it when they go out, and occasionally to run into an office a few feet distant. Under our laws these messengers get eight hundred dollars a year, and if they were to go to any business man in this city they could not get half the money from him for the same kind of service.

We employ common laborers in our executive departments, to do work for which we pay them twice or more than twice as much as they can get anywhere else in the country where they are paid at the current rate of wages. In doing so we demoralize the whole system of labor. We pick one man out of a thousand and give him triple wages, thus making all the rest discontented office-seekers. Now, who is at fault in this? Not the President of the United States, not the Secretary of the Treasury, not the head of any Department of this Administration—not any or all of these, exclusively or mainly. The fault lies here, fellow citizens of the House of Representatives; here with us and our legislation. We make the laws; we fix the rates of wages; we render workingmen discontented with ordinary gains, by picking out and promoting in an unreasonable and exceptional way the few men we hire, and they hold their places at our mercy and at our caprice. They are liable at any moment to be pushed aside for another favorite. Their service is miserable for its uncertainty. It tends to take away their independence and manliness, and make them the mere creatures of those in power.

We do all this ourselves; we go, man by

man, to the heads of these several departments, and say, "Here is a friend of mine; give him a place." We press such appointments upon the departments; we crowd the doors; we fill the corridors; Senators and Representatives throng the offices and bureaus until the public business is obstructed, the patience of officers is worn out, and sometimes, for fear of losing their places by our influence, they at last give way and appoint men, not because they are fit for the positions, but because we ask it. There, Mr. Chairman, is, in my own judgment, the true field for retrenchment and reform. I believe that we can, at almost half the present cost, manage all these departments better than they are now managed if we adopt a judicious system of civil service. There are scores of auditing and accounting officers, heads of bureaus and divisions, there are clerks charged with *quasi* judicial functions, through whose hands pass millions in a day, and upon whose integrity and ability the revenues of the nation largely depend, who are receiving far less than the railroad, telegraph, insurance, manufacturing, and other companies pay for services far less responsible. Such officers we do not pay the market value of their services. When we find that the duties of any office demand ability, cultivation, and experience, let a liberal salary be given in order to procure the services of the best man; and for the mere manual duties of these civil departments, let us get men for the market price.

Now, sir, what do we see? The Republican party is not moving forward to make this needed change. The Democratic party is not moving forward to make it. We are enjoying these privileges, so called, and our political opponents are waiting and watching and hoping for the time to come when they can do the same—when we shall be out of power, and they shall come in, to do the same miserable work of ousting and appointing which we are called upon to do year after year. Now, in the name of justice, in the name of economy, let us take hold of this matter, and sustain the Secretary of the Interior in the kind of work which he is doing, and help all the other departments to follow his example. Some one may say, "That is very fine talk; show us the practice." I

will tell you about the practice. The Patent Office of the Interior Department has during a whole year been conducted in part on the plan I am here advocating. No man, so far as I know, has been appointed to service in that bureau except on a strict competitive examination. The result is that we see in the management of the Patent Office marked efficiency and economy. But what can a department do, what can a bureau do, with the whole weight of Congressional influence pressing for the appointment of men because they are our friends? In this direction is the true line of statesmanship, the true path of economy. I will follow cheerfully in the steps of my distinguished friend whenever he leads toward genuine economy. Let us take this great subject in hand, and it can be settled in a very few weeks.

Y.

CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE.

From "A Century of Congress," in "The Atlantic Monthly," July, 1877.

THIS brings me to consider the present relations of Congress to the other great departments of the Government, and to the people. The limits of this article will permit no more than a glance at a few principal heads of inquiry.

In the main, the balance of powers so admirably adjusted and distributed among the three great departments of the Government has been safely preserved. It was the purpose of our fathers to lodge absolute power nowhere; to leave each department independent within its own sphere, yet, in every case, responsible for the exercise of its discretion. But some dangerous innovations have been made.

And, first, the appointing power of the President has been seriously encroached upon by Congress, or rather by the members of Congress. Curiously enough, this encroachment originated in the act of the Chief Executive himself. The fierce popular hatred of the Federal party, which resulted in the elevation of Jefferson to the Presidency, led that officer to set the first example of removing men from office on account of political opinions. For political causes alone he re-

moved a considerable number of officers who had recently been appointed by President Adams, and thus set the pernicious example. His immediate successors made only a few removals for political reasons. But Jackson made his political opponents who were in office feel the full weight of his executive hand. From that time forward the civil offices of the Government became the prizes for which political parties strove; and, twenty-five years ago, the corrupting doctrine that "to the victors belong the spoils" was shamelessly announced as an article of political faith and practice. It is hardly possible to state with adequate force the noxious influence of this doctrine. It was bad enough when the Federal officers numbered no more than eight or ten thousand; but now, when the growth of the country, and the great increase in the number of public offices occasioned by the late war, have swelled the civil list to more than eighty thousand, and to the ordinary motives for political strife this vast patronage is offered as a reward to the victorious party, the magnitude of the evil can hardly be measured. The public mind has, by degrees, drifted into an acceptance of this doctrine; and thus an election has become a fierce, selfish struggle between the "ins" and the "outs," the one striving to keep and the other to gain the prize of office. It is not possible for any President to select, with any degree of intelligence, so vast an army of office-holders without the aid of men who are acquainted with the people of the various sections of the country. And thus it has become the habit of Presidents to make most of their appointments on the recommendation of members of Congress. During the last twenty-five years it has been understood, by the Congress and the people, that offices are to be obtained by the aid of Senators and Representatives, who thus become the dispensers, sometimes the brokers, of patronage. The members of State Legislatures who choose a Senator, and the district electors who choose a Representative, look to the man of their choice for appointments to office. Thus, from the President downward, through all the grades of official authority, to the electors themselves, civil office becomes a vast corrupting power, to be

used in running the machine of party politics.

This evil has been greatly aggravated by the passage of the Tenure of Office Act of 1867, whose object was to restrain President Johnson from making removals for political cause. But it has virtually resulted in the usurpation by the Senate of a large share of the appointing power. The President can remove no officer without the consent of the Senate; and such consent is not often given, unless the appointment of the successor nominated to fill the proposed vacancy is agreeable to the Senator in whose State the appointee resides. Thus, it has happened that a policy, inaugurated by an early President, has resulted in seriously crippling the just powers of the Executive, and has placed in the hands of Senators and Representatives a power most corrupting and dangerous.

Not the least serious evil resulting from this invasion of the Executive functions by members of Congress is the fact that it greatly impairs their own usefulness as legislators. One third of the working hours of Senators and Representatives is hardly sufficient to meet the demands made upon them in reference to appointments to office. The spirit of that clause of the Constitution which shields them from arrest "during their attendance on the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and from the same," should also shield them from being arrested from their legislative work, morning, noon, and night, by office-seekers. To sum up in a word: the present system invades the independence of the Executive, and makes him less responsible for the character of his appointments; it impairs the efficiency of the legislator by diverting him from his proper sphere of duty, and involving him in the intrigues of aspirants for office; it degrades the civil service itself by destroying the personal independence of those who are appointed; it repels from the service those high and manly qualities which are so necessary to a pure and efficient administration; and, finally, it debauches the public mind by holding up public office as the reward of mere party zeal.

To reform this service is one of the highest and most imperative duties of statesmanship. This reform can not be accomplished

without a complete divorce between Congress and the Executive in the matter of appointments. It will be a proud day when an Administration Senator or Representative, who is in good standing in his party, can say as Thomas Hughes said, during his recent visit to this country, that though he was on the most intimate terms with the members of his own Administration, yet it was not in his power to secure the removal of the humblest clerk in the civil service of his Government.

This is not the occasion to discuss the recent enlargement of the jurisdiction of Congress in reference to the election of a President and Vice-President by the States. But it can not be denied that the Electoral Bill has spread a wide and dangerous field for Congressional action. Unless the boundaries of its power shall be restricted by a new amendment of the Constitution, we have seen the last of our elections of President on the old plan. The power to decide who has been elected may be so used as to exceed the power of electing.

I have long believed that the official relations between the Executive and Congress should be more open and direct. They are now conducted by correspondence with the presiding officers of the two Houses, by consultation with committees, or by private interviews with individual members. This frequently leads to misunderstandings, and may lead to corrupt combinations. It would be far better for both departments if the members of the Cabinet were permitted to sit in Congress and participate in the debates on measures relating to their several departments—but, of course, without a vote. This would tend to secure the ablest men for the chief executive offices; it would bring the policy of the Administration into the fullest publicity by giving both parties ample opportunity for criticism and defense.

VI.

ON THE BILL TO STRENGTHEN THE PUBLIC CREDIT.

In House of Representatives, March 3, 1869.

Now, sir, I favor the first section of this bill because it declares plainly what the law

is. I affirm again, what I have often declared in this Hall, that the law does now require the payment of these bonds in gold. I hope I may without impropriety refer to the fact that during the last session I proved from the record in this House, and in the presence of the author of the law by which these bonds were authorized, that five distinct times in his speech, which immediately preceded the passage of the law, he declared the five-twenty bonds were payable, principal and interest, in gold; and that every member who spoke on the subject took the same ground. That law was passed with that declaration uncontradicted, and it went into effect stamped with that declaration by both Houses of Congress. That speech, made on the eve of the Presidential campaign, was widely circulated throughout the country as a campaign document, and those who held the contrary were repeatedly challenged to refute its statements. I affirm that its correctness was not successfully denied. Not only Congress so understand and declare, but every Secretary of the Treasury from that day to this has declared that these bonds are payable in gold. The authorized agents of the Government sold them, and the people bought them, with this understanding.

The Government thus bound itself by every obligation of honor and good faith, and it was not until one year after the passage of the law that any man in Congress raised even a doubt on the subject. The doubts since raised were raised mainly for electioneering purposes, and the question was referred to the people for arbitrament at the late Presidential election. After the fullest debate ever had on any great question of national politics in a contest in which the two parties fairly and squarely joined issue on the very point, it was solemnly decided by the great majority which elected General Grant that repudiators should be repudiated, and that the faith of the Nation should be preserved inviolate.

We are, therefore, bound by the pledged faith of the Nation, by the spirit and meaning of the law, and finally by the voice of the people themselves, to resolve all doubts and settle the credit of the United States by this explicit declaration of the national will. The

action of the House on this bill has already been hailed throughout the world as the dawn of better days for the finances of the Nation, and every market has shown a wonderful improvement of our credit. We could this day refund our debt on terms more advantageous to the Government by \$120,000,000 than we could have done the day before the passage of this bill by the House. Make it a law, and a still greater improvement will result. I can in no way better indicate my views of the propriety of passing the second section of this bill than by reminding the House that I introduced this proposition in a separate bill on the 10th of February, 1868, and its passage has been more generally demanded by the people and press of the country than any other financial measure before Congress.

The principle involved in this section is simply this: to make it possible for gold to come into this country and to remain here. Gold and silver are lawful money of the United States, and yet the opponents would have us make it unlawful for a citizen to make and enforce contracts which he may hereafter make, to pay gold when he has received gold or its equivalent as the consideration of his contract. The very statement of this doctrine ought to be its sufficient refutation. But the minds of gentlemen are vexed with the fear that this section will be an engine of oppression in the hands of creditors. If any new safeguards can be devised that are not already in this section, I know not what they are. Whenever this law is carried out in its letter and spirit, no injustice can possibly result. The whole power of the law is in the hands of the creditor, and he alone is supposed to be in danger of suffering wrong. In the moment that remains to me I can do no more than to indicate the grounds on which the justice of this measure rests. It is a great and important step toward specie payments, because it removes the unwise and oppressive decree which almost expatriates American gold and silver from the country. It will not only allow our own coin to stay at home, but it will permit foreign coin to flow hither from Europe. More than \$70,000,000 of our gold are going abroad every year, in excess of what comes to us, and at the same time in

eight kingdoms of Europe there are nearly \$500,000,000 of idle gold ready to be invested at less than three per cent. interest. In the Bank of England and the Bank of France there has been for more than a year an average of more than \$300,000,000 of bullion, and most of that time the bank rate of interest has been less than two per cent. Who can doubt that much of this gold will find its way here, if it can be invested without committing the fortunes of its owners to the uncertain chances of unconvertible paper money? But the passage of this bill will enable citizens to transact their business on a fixed and certain basis. It will give stability and confidence to trade, and pave the way for specie payments. The Supreme Court has decided that this is now the law, but let us put it on the statute-book as a notice to the people and to prevent unnecessary litigation.

VII.

GUSTAVE SCHLEICHER.

*Remarks in the House of Representatives,
February 17, 1879.*

THE House having under consideration the resolutions of respect to the memory of the late Hon. Gustave Schleicher—

Mr. Garfield said:

Mr. Speaker: I stand with reverence in the presence of such a life and such a career as that of Gustave Schleicher. It illustrates more strikingly than almost any life I know the mystery that envelops that product which we call character, and which is the result of two great forces: the initial force which the Creator gave it when He called the man into being; and the force of all the external influence and culture that mold and modify the development of a life.

In contemplating the first of these elements, no power of analysis can exhibit all the latent forces enfolded in the spirit of a new-born child, which derive their origin from the thoughts and deeds of remote ancestors, and, enveloped in the awful mystery of life, have been transmitted from generation to generation across forgotten centuries. Each new life is thus "the heir of all the ages."

Applying these reflections to the character of Gustave Schleicher, it may be justly said that we have known few men in whose lives were concentrated so many of the deeply interesting elements that made him what he was. We are accustomed to say, and we have heard to-night, that he was born on foreign soil. In one sense that is true; and yet in a very proper historic sense he was born in our fatherland. One of the ablest of recent historians begins his opening volume with the declaration that England is not the fatherland of the English-speaking people, but the ancient home, the real fatherland of our race, is the ancient forests of Germany. The same thought was suggested by Montesquieu long ago, when he declared in his "Spirit of Laws" that the British Constitution came out of the woods of Germany.

To this day the Teutonic races maintain the same noble traits that Tacitus describes in his admirable history of the manners and character of the Germans. We may therefore say that the friend whose memory we honor to-night is one of the elder brethren of our race. He came to America direct from our fatherland, and not, like our own fathers, by the way of England.

We who were born and have passed all our lives in this wide New World can hardly appreciate the influences that surrounded his early life. Born on the borders of that great forest of Germany, the Odenwald, filled as it is with the memories and traditions of centuries, in which are mingled Scandinavian mythology, legends of the Middle Ages, romances of feudalism and chivalry, histories of barons and kings, and the struggles of a brave people for a better civilization; reared under the institutions of a strong, semi-despotic government; devoting his early life to personal culture, entering at an early age the University of Giessen, venerable with its two and a half centuries of existence, with a library of four hundred thousand volumes at his hand, with a great museum of the curiosities and mysteries of nature to study, he fed his eager spirit upon the rich culture which that Old World could give him, and at twenty-four years of age, in company with a band of thirty-seven young students, like himself, cultivated, earnest, liberty-loving almost to the verge of communism—and

who of us would not be Communists in a despotism?—he came to this country, attracted by one of the most wild and romantic pictures of American history, the picture of Texas as it existed near forty years ago; the country discovered by La Salle at the end of his long and perilous voyages from Quebec to the Northern Lakes and from the lakes to the Gulf of Mexico; the country possessed alternately by the Spanish and the French, and then by Mexico; the country made memorable by such names as Blair and Houston, Albert Sidney Johnston and Mirabeau Lamar, perhaps as adventurous and daring spirits as ever assembled on any spot of the earth; a country that achieved its freedom by heroism never surpassed, and which maintained its perilous independence for ten years in spite of border enemies and European intrigues.

It is said that a society was formed in Europe embracing in its membership men of high rank, even members of royal families, for the purpose of colonizing the new republic of the Lone Star, and making it a dependency of Europe under their patronage; but, without sharing in their designs, some twenty thousand Germans found their way to the new republic, and among these young Schleicher came.

The people of Texas had passed through a period as wild and exciting as the days of the Crusaders, and had just united their fortunes to this Republic. How wide a world opened before these German students! They could hardly imagine how great was the nation of which they became citizens. Even the new State of their adoption was an empire in itself. I suppose few of us who have never visited that State can appreciate its imperial proportions. Vastly larger than the present republic of France; larger than all our Atlantic States from the northern line of Pennsylvania to the southern boundary of Georgia; as large as the six New England States, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and one half of Indiana united. To such a State, with its measureless possibilities of development, young Schleicher came.

It was a noble field for a bright, aspiring, liberty-loving scholar of the Old World, in which to find ample scope for the fullest development of all his powers.

The sketches we have already heard show with what zeal and success our friend made use of his advantages. His career as a member of this House has exhibited the best results of all these influences of nature and nurture. He has done justice to the scholarship which Germany gave him and the large and comprehensive ideas with which life in the New World inspired him.

To exhibit with a little more fullness the origin of those decided opinions which Mr. Schleicher held on the great questions of finance, I venture to refer briefly to an interesting chapter in the history of Texas. It may be doubted whether in any part of the world life has been more intense and experience more varied than among the people of Texas.

In the short space of ten years they had tried the whole range of financial experiments as fully as France had done in two hundred years. Every possible form of monetary theory that is recorded in history Texas had tried; for with that brave, quick-thinking, and quick-acting people, to think was to resolve, and to resolve was to execute.

They had tried a land-bank scheme as wild and magnificent as the land-bank of John Law. They had tried the direct issue of treasury notes, and had seen them go down from par to half, to ten cents, to five cents, to two cents, to nothing on the dollar. They had tried "red-backs" of the republic, notes of corporate banks, scrip of private citizens, and worthless notes from banks of neighboring States, and had seen them all fail. Awakening from the dream of their experiments, under the leadership of clear-sighted men, they put into their Constitution, as they entered the Union, a provision that "in no case shall the Legislature have power to issue treasury warrants, treasury notes, or paper of any description to circulate as money." More radical still, they decreed that "no corporate body shall be created, renewed, or extended with banking or discounting privileges," and "no person or persons within this State shall issue any bill, promissory note, or other paper to circulate as money." They put an end to all paper-money systems, and since then the majority of the people of that State have never looked

with favor upon any other currency than specie.

With such traditions and influences among the people of his adoption, and with a student life back of it, formed in the solid Old World ways of thinking, it is not wonderful that in all our financial discussions here we found Mr. Schleicher the sturdy supporter and able advocate of a currency based on coin of real value and full weight. I would say nothing that has even the appearance of controversy on this occasion. I mention these facts only to do justice to his memory.

Of his character as we knew it here, two things struck me as most notable. First, he possessed that quality without which no man ever did, and I hope no man ever will, achieve success in this forum—the habit of close, earnest, hard work. All his associates knew that when he rose to speak in this hall, it was because he had something to say, something that was the result of work, and that he said it because it came from the depth of his convictions, as the result of his fullest investigation.

I stop to notice the fact that, although he spoke with an accent brought from the fatherland, he had that rare purity of language and style which I am inclined to believe that you and I, Mr. Speaker, will never achieve, and which few persons on our soil can rival. We learned our language in the street; he came at once into the parlors of English, and learned it from the masters. His printed English was as pure as the purest which can be found in the records of our debates.

He possessed and exhibited a noteworthy independence of character. In this he taught a lesson which ought never to be forgotten here. His people trusted him, and by their approval enforced the lesson that the men who succeed best in public life are those who take the risk of standing by their own convictions. That principle never fails in the long run, for the people who send representatives here do not want a mere echo, but a man who sees with his own eyes and fearlessly utters his own thoughts, as our friend did with a boldness and courage that made him a worthy example to all American statesmen.

VIII.

THE TARIFF.

From a Speech in the House of Representatives, June 4, 1878

I HAVE given this brief historical sketch for the purpose of exhibiting the ideas out of which the tariff legislation of this country has sprung. It has received the support of the most renowned names in our early history; and, though the principle of protection has sometimes been carried to an unreasonable extreme, thus bringing reproach upon the system, it has nevertheless borne many of the fruits which were anticipated by those who planted the germ.

Gentlemen who oppose this view of public policy tell us that they favor a tariff for revenue alone. I, therefore, invite their attention to the revenue phase of the question. The estimated expenditures for the next fiscal year are two hundred and eighty and one half million dollars, including interest on the public debt and the appropriations required by law for the sinking fund. The Secretary of the Treasury estimates the revenues which our present laws will furnish at \$269,000,000: from customs, one hundred and thirty-three millions; from internal revenue, one hundred and twenty millions; and from miscellaneous sources, sixteen millions. He tells us that it will be necessary to cut down the expenditures eleven millions below the estimates in order to prevent a deficit of that amount. The revenues of the last fiscal year failed by three and a quarter millions to meet the expenditures required by law.

In the face of these facts can we safely diminish our revenues? If we mean to preserve the public faith and meet all the necessities of the Government, we can not reduce the present revenues a single dollar. Yet the majority of this House not only propose to reduce the internal tax on spirits and tobacco, but they propose in this bill to reduce the revenues on customs by at least six millions. To avoid the disgrace of a deficit, they propose to suspend the operations of the sinking fund, and thereby shake the foundation of the public credit. But they tell us that some of the reductions made in this bill

will increase rather than diminish the revenue. Perhaps on a few articles this will be true; but as a whole it is undeniable that this bill will effect a considerable reduction in the revenues from customs.

Gentlemen on the other side have been in the habit of denouncing our present tariff laws as destructive to rather than productive of revenue. Let me invite their attention to a few plain facts.

During the fifteen years that preceded our late war—a period of so-called revenue tariffs—we raised from customs an average annual revenue of forty-seven and a half million dollars, never in any year receiving more than sixty-four millions. That system brought us a heavy deficit in 1860, so that Congress was compelled to borrow money to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government.

Do they tell us that our present law fails to produce an adequate revenue? They denounce it as not a revenue tariff. Let them wrestle with the following fact: During the eleven years that have passed since the close of the war, we have averaged one hundred and seventy and one half million dollars of revenue per annum from customs alone. Can they say that this is not a revenue tariff which produces more than three times as much revenue per annum as that law did which they delight to call "the revenue tariff"? In one year, 1872, the revenues from customs amounted to two hundred and twelve millions. Can they say that the present law does not produce revenue? It produces from textile fabrics alone more revenue than we ever raised from all sources under any tariff before the war. From this it follows that the assault upon the present law fails if made on the score of revenue alone.

I freely admit that revenue is the primary object of taxation. That object is attained by existing law. But it is an incidental and vitally important object of the law to keep in healthy growth those industries which are necessary to the well-being of the whole country. If gentlemen can show me that this is, as they allege, class legislation, which benefits the few at the expense of the many, I will abandon it, and join them in opposing it. This is the

Legislature of the nation; and it should make laws which will bless the whole nation. I do not affirm that all the provisions of the existing tariff law are wise and just. In many respects they are badly adjusted, and need amendment. But I insist that in their main features they are national, not partial; that they promote the general welfare, and not the welfare of the few at the expense of the many.

Let us glance at the leading industries which, under the provisions of the existing law, are enabled to maintain themselves in the sharp struggle of competition with other countries. I will name them in five groups. In the first I place the textile fabrics, manufactures of cotton, wool, flax, hemp, jute, and silk. From these we received during the last fiscal year fifty million dollars, which is more than one third of all our customs revenue.

It is said that a tax should not be levied upon the clothing of the people. This would be a valid objection were it not for the fact that objects of the highest national importance are secured by its imposition. That forty-five millions of people should be able to clothe themselves without helpless dependence upon other nations is a matter of transcendent importance to every citizen. What American can be indifferent to the fact that in the year 1875 the State of Massachusetts alone produced 992,000,000 yards of textile fabrics, and in doing so consumed seventy-five million dollars' worth of the products of the fields and flocks, and gave employment to 120,000 artisans? There is a touch of pathos in the apologetic reply of Governor Spottswood, an early colonial Governor of Virginia, when he wrote to his British superiors:

The people of Virginia, more of necessity than inclination, attempt to clothe themselves with their own manufactures. . . . It is certainly necessary to divert their application to some commodity less prejudicial to the trade of England.—“Banerhoff's History of the United States,” vol. iv, page 104.

Thanks to our independence, such apologies are no longer needed. Some of the rates on the textiles are exorbitant and ought to be reduced; but the general principle which pervades the group is wise and benefi-

cent, not only as a means of raising revenue, but as a measure of national economy.

In the second group I have placed the metals, including glass and chemicals. Though the tariff upon this group has been severely denounced in this debate, the rate does not average more than thirty-six per cent. *ad valorem*, and the group produced about \$14,000,000 of revenue last year. Besides serving as a source of public revenue, what intelligent man fails to see that the metals are the basis of all the machinery, tools, and implements of every industry? More than any other in the world's history, this is the age when inventive genius is bending all its energies to devise means to increase the effectiveness of human labor. The mechanical wonders displayed at our Centennial Exposition are a sufficient illustration.

The people that can not make their own implements of industry must be content to take a very humble and subordinate place in the family of nations. The people that can not, at any time, by their own previous training, arm and equip themselves for war, must be content to exist by the sufferance of others.

I do not say that no rates in this group are too high. Some of them can safely be reduced. But I do say these industries could not have attained their present success without the national care; and to abandon them now will prevent their continued prosperity.

In the third group I place wines, spirits, and tobacco in its various forms which come from abroad. On these rates of duty range from 85 to 95 per cent. *ad valorem*; and from them we collected last year \$10,000,000 of revenue. The wisdom of this tax will hardly be disputed by any one.

In the fourth group I have placed imported provisions which come in competition with the products of our own fields and herds, including breadstuffs, salt, rice, sugar, molasses, and spices. On these provisions imported into this country we collected last year a revenue of \$42,000,000, \$37,000,000 of which was collected on sugar. Of the duty on the principal article of this group I shall speak further on in the discussion.

On the fifth group, comprising leather

and manufactures of leather, we received about \$3,000,000 of revenue.

On the imports included in the five groups I have mentioned, which comprise the great manufacturing industries of the country, we collect \$119,000,000—more than 90 per cent. of all our customs revenue. I ask if it be not an object of the highest national importance to keep alive and in vigorous health and growth the industries included in these groups? What sort of people should we be if we did not keep them alive? Suppose we were to follow the advice of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Tucker] when he said:

Why should we make pig-iron when with Berkshire pigs raised upon our farms we can buy more iron pigs from England than we can get by trying to make them ourselves? We can get more iron pigs from England for Berkshire pigs than we can from the Pennsylvania manufacturers. Why, then, should I not be permitted to send there for them? . . .

What a market for our raw material, for our products, if we only would take the hand which Great Britain extends to us for free trade between us!

For a single season, perhaps, his plan might be profitable to the consumers of iron; but if his policy were adopted as a permanent one, it would reduce us to a merely agricultural people, whose chief business would be to produce the simplest raw materials by the least skill and culture, and let the men of brains of other countries do our thinking for us, and provide for us all products requiring the cunning hand of the artisan, while we would be compelled to do the drudgery for ourselves and for them.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Tucker] is too good a logician not to see that the theory he advocates can only be realized in a state of universal peace and brotherhood among the nations; and, in developing his plan, he says:

Commerce, Mr. Chairman, links all mankind in one common brotherhood of mutual dependence and interests, and thus creates that unity of our race which makes the resources of all the property of each and every member. We can not if we would, and should not if we could, remain isolated and alone. Men under the benign influence of Christianity yearn for intercourse, for the inter-

change of thought and the products of thought, as a means of a common progress toward a nobler civilization. . . .

Mr. Chairman, I can not believe this is according to the Divine plan. Christianity bids us seek, in communion with our brethren of every race and clime, the blessings they can afford us, and to bestow in return upon them those with which our new continent is destined to fill the world.

This, I admit, is a grand conception, a beautiful vision of the time when all the nations will dwell in peace; when all will be, as it were, one nation, each furnishing to the others what they can not profitably produce, and all working harmoniously together in the millennium of peace. If all the kingdoms of the world should become the kingdom of the Prince of Peace, then I admit that universal free trade ought to prevail. But that blessed era is yet too remote to be made the basis of the practical legislation of to-day. We are not yet members of "the parliament of man, the federation of the world." For the present, the world is divided into separate nationalities; and that other divine command still applies to our situation: "He that provideth not for his own household has denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel"; and, until that better era arrives, patriotism must supply the place of universal brotherhood.

For the present Gortchakoff can do more good to the world by taking care of Russia. The great Bismarck can accomplish more for his era by being, as he is, German to the core, and promoting the welfare of the German empire. Let Beaconsfield take care of England, and MacMahon of France, and let Americans devote themselves to the welfare of America. When each does his best for his own nation to promote prosperity, justice, and peace, all will have done more for the world than if all had attempted to be cosmopolitans rather than patriots.

But I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have no sympathy with those who approach this question only from the standpoint of their own local, selfish interest. When a man comes to me and says, "Put a prohibitory duty on the foreign article which competes with my product, that I may get rich more rapidly," he does not excite my sym-

pathy; he repels me; and when another says, "Give no protection to the manufacturing industries, for I am not a manufacturer and do not care to have them sustained," I say that he, too, is equally mercenary and unpatriotic. If we were to legislate in that spirit, I might turn to the gentleman from Chicago and say, "Do not ask me to vote for an appropriation to build a court-house or a post-office in your city; I never expect to get any letters from that office, and the people of my district never expect to be in your courts." If we were to act in this spirit of narrow isolation, we should be unfit for the national positions we occupy.

Too much of our tariff discussion has been warped by narrow and sectional considerations. But when we base our action upon the conceded national importance of the great industries I have referred to, when we recognize the fact that artisans and their products are essential to the well-being of our country, it follows that there is no dweller in the humblest cottage on our remotest frontier who has not a deep personal interest in the legislation that shall promote these great national industries. Those arts that enable our Nation to rise in the scale of civilization bring their blessings to all, and patriotic citizens will cheerfully bear a fair share of the burden necessary to make their country great and self-sustaining. I will defend a tariff that is national in its aims, that protects and sustains those interests without which the Nation can not become great and self-sustaining.

So important, in my view, is the ability of the Nation to manufacture all these articles necessary to arm, equip, and clothe our people, that if it could not be secured in any other way I would vote to pay money out of the Federal Treasury to maintain Government iron and steel, woolen and cotton mills, at whatever cost. Were we to neglect these great interests and depend upon other nations, in what a condition of helplessness would we find ourselves when we should be again involved in war with the very nations on whom we were depending to furnish us these supplies? The system adopted by our fathers is wiser; for it so encourages the great national industries as to make it possible at

all times for our people to equip themselves for war, and at the same time increase their intelligence and skill so as to make them better fitted for all the duties of citizenship, both in war and in peace. We provide for the common defense by a system which promotes the general welfare.

I have tried thus summarily to state the grounds on which a tariff which produces the necessary revenue, and at the same time promotes American manufactures, can be sustained by large-minded men for national reasons. How high the rates of such a tariff ought to be is a question on which there may fairly be differences of opinion.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, on this question I have long occupied a position between two extremes of opinion. I have long believed, and I still believe, that the worst evil which has afflicted the interests of American artisans and manufacturers has been the tendency to extremes in our tariff legislation. Our history for the past fifty years has been a repetition of the same mistake. One party comes into power, and, believing that a protective tariff is a good thing, establishes a fair rate of duty. Not content with that, they say: "This works well; let us have more of it." And they raise the rates still higher, and perhaps go beyond the limits of national interest.

Every additional step in that direction increases the opposition and threatens the stability of the whole system. When the policy of increase is pushed beyond a certain point, the popular reaction sets in; the opposite party gets into power and cuts down the high rates. Not content with reducing the rates that are unreasonable, they attack and destroy the whole protective system. Then follows a deficit in the Treasury, the destruction of manufacturing interests, until the reaction again sets in, the free-traders are overthrown, and a protective system is again established. In not less than four distinct periods during the last fifty years has this sort of revolution taken place in our industrial system. Our great national industries have thus been tossed up and down between two extremes of opinion.

During my term of service in this House I have resisted the effort to increase the

rates of duty, whenever I thought an increase would be dangerous to the stability of our manufacturing interests; and by doing so, I have sometimes been thought unfriendly to the policy of protecting American industry. When the necessity of the revenues and the safety of our manufactures warranted, I have favored a reduction of rates; and these reductions have aided to preserve the stability of the system. In one year, soon after the close of the war, we raised two hundred and twelve millions of dollars of revenue from customs.

In 1870 we reduced the customs duties by the sum of twenty-nine and one half millions of dollars. In 1872 they were again reduced by the sum of forty-four and one half millions. Those reductions were in the main wise and judicious; and although I did not vote for them all, yet they have put the fair-minded men of this country in a position where they can justly resist any considerable reduction below the present rates.

My view of the danger of extreme positions on the question of tariff rates may be illustrated by a remark made by Horace Greeley in the last conversation I ever had with that distinguished man. Said he:

My criticism of you is that you are not sufficiently high protective in views.

I replied:

What would you advise?

He said:

If I had my way—if I were king of this country—I would put a duty of one hundred dollars a ton on pig iron, and a proportionate duty on everything else that can be produced in America. The result would be that our people would be obliged to supply their own wants; manufactures would spring up; competition would finally reduce prices; and we should live wholly within ourselves.

I replied that the fatal objection to his theory was that no man is king of this country, with power to make his policy permanent. But as all our policies depend upon popular support, the extreme measure proposed would beget an opposite extreme, and our industries would suffer from violent reactions. For this reason I believe that we ought to seek that point of stable equilibrium

somewhere between a prohibitory tariff on the one hand, and a tariff that gives no protection on the other. What is that point of stable equilibrium? In my judgment it is this: a rate so high that foreign producers can not flood our markets and break down our home manufacturers, but not so high as to keep them altogether out, enabling our manufacturers to combine and raise the prices, nor so high as to stimulate an unnatural and unhealthy growth of manufactures.

In other words, I would have the duty so adjusted that every great American industry can fairly live and make fair profits; and yet so low that if our manufacturers attempted to put up prices unreasonably, the competition from abroad would come in and bring down prices to a fair rate. Such a tariff I believe will be supported by the great majority of Americans. We are not far from having such a tariff in our present law. In some respects we have departed from that standard. Wherever it does, we should amend it, and by so doing we shall secure stability and prosperity.

This brings me to the consideration of the pending bill. It was my hope, at the beginning of the present session, that the Committee of Ways and Means would enter upon a revision of the tariff in the spirit I have indicated. The Secretary of the Treasury suggested in his annual report that a considerable number of articles, which produced but a small amount of revenue, and were not essential to the prosperity of our manufactures, could be placed upon the free list, thus simplifying the law and making it more consistent in its details. I was ready to assist in such a work of revision; but the committee had not gone far before it was evident that they intended to attack the whole system, and, as far as possible, destroy it. The results of their long and arduous labors are embodied in the pending bill.

Some of the rates can be slightly reduced without serious harm; but many of the reductions proposed in this bill will be fatal. It is related that when a surgeon was probing an emperor's wound to find the ball, he said:

Can your Majesty allow me to go deeper?

His Majesty replied:

Probe a little deeper and you will find the Emperor.

It is a little deeper probing by this bill that will touch the vital interests of this country and destroy them.

Some of its provisions are wise, and ought to be adopted. One particularly, which establishes a new test of the value of sugar, should, if possible, become a law before this session ends. But, in my judgment, the bill as a whole is a most unwise and dangerous measure; dangerous to the great national industries of this country, so dangerous that, if we should pass it, it would greatly increase the prevailing distress, and would make the condition of our artisans deplorable to the last degree.

The chief charge I make against this bill is, that it seeks to cripple the protective features of the law. It increases rates where an increase is not necessary, and it cuts them down where cutting will kill. One of the wisest provisions of our present law is the establishment of a definite free list. From year to year, when it has been found that any article could safely be liberated from duty, it has been put upon the free list. A large number of raw materials have thus been made free of duty. This has lightened the burdens of taxation, and at the same time aided the industries of the country.

To show the progress that has been made in this direction, it should be remembered that in 1867 the value of all articles imported free of duty was but \$39,000,000, while in 1877 the free imports amounted to \$181,000,000.

As I have already said, the Secretary of the Treasury recommends a still further increase of the free list. But this bill abolishes the free list altogether, and imposes duties upon a large share of articles now free. And this is done in order to make still greater reduction upon articles that must be protected if their manufacture is maintained in this country.

Let me notice a few of the great industries at which this bill strikes. In the group of textile fabrics, of which I have spoken, reductions are made upon the manufactures of cotton, which will stop three quarters of the cotton mills of the country and hope-

lessly prostrate the business. Still greater violence is done to the wool and woolen interests. The attempt has been made to show that the business of wool-growing has declined in consequence of our present law, and the fact has been pointed out that the number of sheep has been steadily falling off in the Eastern States. The truth is that sheep-culture in the United States was never in so healthy a condition as it is to-day. In 1860 our total wool product was sixty millions of pounds. In 1877 we produced two hundred and eight millions of pounds.

It is true that there is not now so large a number of sheep in the Eastern States as there were a few years since; but the center of that industry has been shifted. Of the thirty-five and a half millions of sheep now in the United States, fourteen and a half millions are in Texas and the States and Territories west of the Rocky Mountains. California alone has six and a half millions of sheep. Not the least important feature of this interest is the facility it offers for cheap animal food. A great French statesman has said: "It is more important to provide food than clothing"; and the growth of the sheep accomplishes both objects. Ninety-five per cent. of all the woolen fabrics manufactured in this country are now made of native wool.

The tariff on wool and woollens was adopted in 1867, after a most careful and thorough examination of both the producing and the manufacturing interests. It was the result of an adjustment between the farmers and manufacturers, and has been advantageous to both. A small reduction of the rates could be made without injury.

Both of these interests consented to a reduction, and submitted their plan to the Committee of Ways and Means. But instead of adopting it, the Committee have struck those interests down and put a dead-level ad valorem duty upon all wools. The Chairman tells us that the Committee had sought to do away with the ad valorem system, because it gave rise to fraudulent invoices and undervaluation. Yet on the interest that yields twenty millions of revenue he proposes to strike down the specific duties and put the interest upon one dead

level of ad valorem duty without regard to quality.

I would not introduce sectional topics in this discussion, but I must notice one curious feature of this bill. In the great group of provisions, on which nearly fifty millions of revenue are paid into the Treasury, I find that thirty-seven millions of that amount come from imported sugar. No one would defend the levying of so heavy a tax upon a necessary article of food, were it not that a great agricultural interest is thereby protected; and that interest is mainly confined to the State of Louisiana. I am glad that the Government has given its aid to the State, for not a pound of sugar could be manufactured there, if the tariff law did not protect it.

As the law now stands, the average ad valorem duty on sugar is sixty-two and a half per cent. But what has this bill done? The complaint is made by its advocates that the rates are now too high. The rates on all dutiable articles average about forty-two per cent.; yet on sugar the average is sixty-two and a half per cent., greatly above the average. This bill puts up the average duty on sugar to about seventy per cent. This one interest, which is already protected by a duty much higher than the average, is here granted a still higher rate, while other interests, now far below the average rate, are put still lower. Metals, that now average but thirty-six per cent. ad valorem—far less than the general average, but little more than half of the rate on sugar—are cut down still more, while the protection of the sugar interest is made still higher.

If the planters of Louisiana were to get the benefit, there would be some excuse for the increase; but what is the fact? One thousand four hundred and fifteen million pounds of sugar were imported into this country last year, but not one pound of refined sugar; every pound was imported in the crude form, going into the hands of about twenty-five gentlemen, mostly in the city of New York, who refine every pound of this enormous quantity of imported sugar. This bill increases the rates on the high grades of sugar far more than on the lower grades, and makes the importation of any finished sugar impossible. It strengthens and makes abso-

lute the monopoly already given to the refining interest; yet we are told that this is a revenue-reform tariff.

Before closing I wish to notice one thing, which, I believe, has not been mentioned in this debate. A few years ago we had a considerable premium on gold, and as our tariff duties were paid in coin there was thus created an increase in the tariff rates. In 1875, for instance, the average currency value of coin was one hundred and fourteen cents; in 1876, one hundred and eleven cents; in 1877, one hundred and four cents. Now, thanks to the resumption law and the rate of our exchanges and credit, the premium on gold is almost down to zero. But this fall in the premium has operated as a steady reduction of the tariff rates, because the duties were paid in gold and the goods were sold in currency.

Now, when gentlemen say that the rates were high a few years ago, it should be remembered that they have been falling year by year, as the price of gold has been coming down. When, therefore, gentlemen criticise the rates as fixed in the law of 1872, they should remember that the fall in the premium on gold has wrought a virtual reduction of fourteen per cent. in the tariff rates.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee of Ways and Means has done a large amount of work on this bill. The Chairman has labored in season and out of season, and he deserves credit of his friends for the energy and earnestness with which he has addressed himself to this task. But the views which have found expression in his bill must be criticised without regard to personal consideration. A bill so radical in its character, so dangerous to our business prosperity, would work infinite mischief at this time, when the country is just recovering itself from a long period of depression and getting again upon solid ground, just coming up out of the wild sea of panic and distress which has tossed us so long.

Let it be remembered that twenty-two per cent. of all the laboring people of this country are artisans engaged in manufactures. Their culture has been fostered by our tariff laws. It is their pursuits, and the skill which they have developed, that pro-

duced the glory of our Centennial Exhibition. To them the country owes the splendor of the position it holds before the world more than to any other equal number of our citizens. If this bill becomes a law, it strikes down their occupation, and throws into the keenest distress the brightest and best elements of our population.

I implore this House not to permit us to be thrown into greater confusion, either by letting this bill become a law, or by letting it hang over the country as a menace. And in all kindness to the Chairman of the Committee, and the gentlemen who think with him, I hope we will sit here to-night until the second reading of the bill is commenced. When the first paragraph has been read I will propose to strike out the enacting clause.

If the Committee will do that, we can kill the bill to-day. It is not simply a stalking-horse, upon which gentlemen can leap to show their horsemanship in debate; it is not an innocent lay-figure, upon which gentlemen may spread the gaudy wares of their rhetoric without harm; but it is a great, dangerous monster, a very Polyphemus which stalks through the land—

“Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.”

If its eye be not out, let us take it out and end the agony.

IX.

THE CURRENCY.

From a Speech in the House of Representatives, May 15, 1868.

I SHALL direct my remarks on this occasion to but one feature of our legislation. I propose to discuss the currency and its relation to the revenue and business prosperity of the country.

In April, 1861, there began in this country an industrial revolution, not yet completed, as gigantic in its proportions, and as far-reaching in its consequences, as the political and military revolution through which we have passed. As the first step to any intelligent discussion of the currency, it is necessary to examine the character and progress of that industrial revolution.

The year 1860 was one of remarkable prosperity in all branches of business. For seventy years no Federal tax-gatherer had ever been seen among the laboring population of the United States. Our public debt was less than sixty-five million dollars. The annual expenditures of the Government, including interest on the public debt, were less than sixty-four million dollars. The revenues from customs alone amounted to six sevenths of the expenditures. The value of our agricultural products for that year amounted to \$1,625,000,000. Our cotton crop alone was two billion one hundred and fifty-five million pounds, and we supplied to the markets of the world seven eighths of all the cotton consumed. Our merchant marine engaged in foreign trade amounted to two million five hundred and forty-six thousand two hundred and thirty-seven tons, and promised soon to rival the immense carrying trade of England.

Let us now observe the effect of the war on the various departments of business. From the moment the first hostile gun was fired, the Federal and State Governments became gigantic consumers. As far as production was concerned, eleven States were completely separated from the Union. Two million laborers, more than one third of the adult population of the Northern States, were withdrawn from the ranks of producers, and became only consumers of wealth. The Federal Government became an insatiable devourer. Leaving out of account the vast sums expended by States, counties, cities, towns, and individuals for the payment of bounties, for the relief of sick and wounded soldiers and their families, and omitting the losses, which can never be estimated, of property destroyed by hostile armies, I shall speak only of expenditures which appear on the books of the Federal Treasury. From the 30th of June, 1861, to the 30th of June, 1865, there were paid out of the Federal Treasury \$3,340,996,211, making an aggregate during these four years of more than \$836,000,000 per annum.

From the official records of the Treasury Department it appears that, from the beginning of the American Revolution in 1775 to the beginning of the late rebellion, the total

expenditures of the Government for all purposes, including the assumed war debts of the States, amounted to \$2,250,000,000. The expenditures of four years of the rebellion were nearly \$1,100,000,000 more than all the other Federal expenses since the Declaration of Independence. The debt of England, which had its origin in the revolution of 1688, and was increased by more than one hundred years of war and other political disasters, had reached in 1793 the sum of \$1,268,000,000. During the twenty-two years that followed, while England was engaged in a life and death struggle with Napoleon (the greatest war in history save our own), \$3,056,000,000 were added to her debt. In our four years of war we spent \$300,000,000 more than the amount by which England increased her debt in twenty-two years of war; almost as much as she had increased it in one hundred and twenty-five years of war. Now, the enormous demand which this expenditure created for all the products of industry stimulated to an unparalleled degree every department of business. The plow, furnace, mill, loom, railroad, steamboat, telegraph — all were driven to their utmost capacity. Warehouses were emptied; and the great reserves of supply, which all nations in a normal state keep on hand, were exhausted to meet the demands of the great consumer. For many months, the Government swallowed three millions per day of the products of industry. Under the pressure of this demand, prices rose rapidly in every department of business. Labor everywhere found quick and abundant returns. Old debts were canceled, and great fortunes were made.

For the transaction of this enormous business an increased amount of currency was needed; but I doubt if any member of this House can be found, bold enough to deny that the deluge of Treasury notes poured upon the country during the war was far greater even than the great demands of business. Let it not be forgotten, however, that the chief object of these issues was not to increase the currency of the country. They were authorized with great reluctance, and under the pressure of overwhelming necessity, as a temporary expedi-

ent to meet the demands of the Treasury. They were really forced loans in the form of Treasury notes. By the act of July 17, 1861, an issue of demand notes was authorized to the amount of \$50,000,000. By the act of August 5, 1861, this amount was increased \$50,000,000 more. By the act of February 25, 1862, an additional issue of \$150,000,000 was authorized. On the 17th of the same month, an unlimited issue of fractional currency was authorized. On the 17th of January, 1863, an issue of \$150,000,000 more was authorized, which was increased \$50,000,000 by the act of March 3d of the same year. This act also authorized the issue of one and two years' Treasury notes, bearing interest at five per cent., to be a legal tender for their face, to the amount of \$400,000,000. By the act of June 30, 1864, an issue of six per cent. compound-interest notes, to be a legal tender for their face, was authorized, to the amount of \$200,000,000. In addition to this, many other forms of paper obligation were authorized, which, though not a legal tender, performed many of the functions of currency. By the act of March 1, 1862, the issue of an unlimited amount of certificates of indebtedness was authorized, and within ninety days after the passage of the act there had been issued and were outstanding of these certificates more than \$156,000,000. Of course these issues were not all outstanding at the same time, but the acts show how great was the necessity for loans during the war.

The law which made the vast volume of United States notes a legal tender operated as an act of general bankruptcy. The man who loaned \$1,000 in July, 1861, payable in three years, was compelled by this law to accept at maturity, as a full discharge of the debt, an amount of currency equal in value to \$350 of the money he loaned. Private indebtedness was everywhere canceled. Rising prices increased the profits of business, but this prosperity was caused by the great demand for products, and not by the abundance of paper money. As a means of transacting the vast business of the country, a great volume of currency was indispensable, and its importance can not be well overestimated. But let us not be led into the

fatal error of supposing that paper money created the business or produced the wealth. As well might it be alleged that our rivers and canals produce the grain which they float to market. Like currency, the channels of commerce stimulate production, but can not nullify the inexorable law of demand and supply.

Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored to trace the progress of our industrial revolution in passing from peace to war. In returning from war to peace all the conditions were reversed. At once the Government ceased to be an all-devouring consumer. Nearly two million able-bodied men were discharged from the army and navy and enrolled in the ranks of the producers. The expenditures of the Government, which, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1865, amounted to \$1,290,000,000, were reduced to \$520,000,000 in 1866; to \$346,000,000 in 1867; and, if the retrenchment measures recommended by the Special Commissioner of the Revenue be adopted, another year will bring them below \$300,000,000.

Thus during the first year after the war the demands of the Federal Government as a consumer decreased sixty per cent.; and in the second year the decrease had reached seventy-four per cent., with a fair prospect of a still further reduction.

The recoil of this sudden change would have produced great financial disaster in 1866, but for the fact that there was still open to industry the work of replacing the wasted reserves of supply, which, in all countries in a healthy state of business, are estimated to be sufficient for two years. During 1866, the fall in price of all articles of industry amounted to an average of ten per cent. One year ago a table was prepared at my request, by Mr. Edward Young, in the office of the Special Commissioner of the Revenue, exhibiting a comparison of wholesale prices at New York in December, 1865, and December, 1866. It shows that in ten leading articles of provisions there was an average decline of twenty-two per cent., though beef, flour, and other breadstuffs remained nearly stationary. On cotton and woolen goods, boots, shoes, and clothing, the decline was thirty per cent. On the products of manufacture and mining, including coal,

cordage, iron, lumber, naval stores, oils, tallow, tin, and wool, the decline was twenty-five per cent. The average decline on all commodities was at least ten per cent. According to the estimates of the Special Commissioner of the Revenue in his late report, the average decline during 1867 has amounted at least to ten per cent. more. During the past two years Congress has provided by law for reducing internal taxation \$100,000,000; and the act passed a few weeks ago has reduced the tax on manufactures to the amount of \$64,000,000 per annum. The repeal of the cotton tax will make a further reduction of \$20,000,000. State and municipal taxation and expenditures have also been greatly reduced. The work of replacing these reserves delayed the shock and distributed its effects, but could not avert the inevitable result. During the past two years, one by one, the various departments of industry produced a supply equal to the demand. Then followed a glutted market, a fall in prices, and a stagnation of business, by which thousands of laborers were thrown out of employment.

If to this it be added that the famine in Europe and the drought in many of the agricultural States of the Union have kept the price of provisions from falling as other commodities have fallen, we shall have a sufficient explanation of the stagnation of business, and the unusual distress among our people.

This industrial revolution has been governed by laws beyond the reach of Congress. No legislation could have arrested it at any stage of its progress. The most that could possibly be done by Congress was, to take advantage of the prosperity it occasioned to raise a revenue for the support of the Government, and to mitigate the severity of its subsequent pressure, by reducing the vast machinery of war to the lowest scale possible. Manifestly nothing can be more absurd than to suppose that the abundance of currency produced the prosperity of 1863, 1864, and 1865, or that the want of it is the cause of our present stagnation.

In order to reach a satisfactory understanding of the currency question, it is necessary to consider somewhat fully the nature and functions of money or any substitute for it.

The theory of money which formed the basis of the "mercantile system" of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has been rejected by all leading financiers and political economists for the last seventy-five years. That theory asserted that money is wealth; that the great object of every nation should be to increase its amount of gold and silver; that this was a direct increase of national wealth.

It is now held as an indisputable truth that money is an instrument of trade and performs but two functions. It is a measure of value and a medium of exchange.

In cases of simple barter, where no money is used, we estimate the relative values of the commodities to be exchanged in dollars and cents, it being our only universal measure of value.

As a medium of exchange, money is to all business transactions what ships are to the transportation of merchandise. If a hundred vessels of a given tonnage are just sufficient to carry all the commodities between two ports, any increase of the number of vessels will correspondingly decrease the value of each as an instrument of commerce; any decrease below one hundred will correspondingly increase the value of each. If the number be doubled, each will carry but half its usual freight, will be worth but half its former value for that trade. There is so much work to be done, and no more. A hundred vessels can do it all. A thousand can do no more than all.

The functions of money as a medium of exchange, though more complicated in their application, are precisely the same in principle as the functions of the vessels in the case I have supposed.

If we could ascertain the total value of all the exchanges effected in this country by means of money in any year, and could ascertain how many dollars' worth of such exchanges can be effected in a year by one dollar in money, we should know how much money the country needed for the business transactions of that year. Any decrease below that amount will correspondingly increase the value of each dollar as an instrument of exchange. Any increase above that amount will correspondingly decrease the value of each dollar. If that amount be

doubled, each dollar of the whole mass will perform but half the amount of business it did before; will be worth but half its former value as a medium of exchange.

Recurring to our illustration: if, instead of sailing vessels, steam vessels were substituted, a much smaller tonnage would be required; so, if it were found that \$500,000,000 of paper, each worth seventy cents in gold, were sufficient for the business of the country, it is equally evident that \$350,000,000 of gold substituted for the paper would perform precisely the same amount of business.

It should be remembered, also, that any improvement in the mode of transacting business, by which the actual use of money is in part dispensed with, reduces the total amount needed by the country. How much has been accomplished in this direction by recent improvements in banking may be seen in the operations of the clearing-houses in our great cities.

The records of the New York Clearing-House show that from October 11, 1853, the date of its establishment, to October 11, 1867, the exchanges amounted to nearly \$180,000,000,000; to effect which, less than \$8,000,000,000 of money were used, an average of about four per cent.; that is, exchanges were made to the amount of \$100,000,000 by the payment of \$4,000,000 of money.

It is also a settled principle that all deposits in banks, drawn upon by checks and drafts, really serve the purpose of money.

The amount of currency needed in the country depends, as we have seen, upon the amount of business transacted by means of money. The amount of business, however, is varied by many causes which are irregular and uncertain in their operation. An Indian war, deficient or abundant harvests, an overflow of the cotton lands of the South, a bread famine or war in Europe, and a score of such causes entirely beyond the reach of legislation, may make money deficient this year and abundant next. The needed amount varies also from month to month in the same year. More money is required in the autumn, when the vast products of agriculture are being moved to market, than when the great army of laborers are in winter-quarters, awaiting the seedtime.

When the money of the country is gold and silver, it adapts itself to the fluctuations of business without the aid of legislation. If, at any time, we have more than is needed, the surplus flows off to other countries through the channels of international commerce. If less, the deficiency is supplied through the same channels. Thus the monetary equilibrium is maintained. So immense is the trade of the world that the golden streams pouring from California and Australia in the specie circulation, are soon absorbed in the great mass and equalized throughout the world, as the waters of all the rivers are spread upon the surface of all the seas.

Not so, however, with an inconvertible paper currency. Excepting the specie used in payment of customs and the interest on our public debt, we are cut off from the money currents of the world. Our currency resembles rather the waters of an artificial lake, which lie in stagnation or rise to full banks at the caprice of the gatekeeper.

Gold and silver abhor depreciated paper money, and will not keep company with it. If our currency be more abundant than business demands, not a dollar of it can go abroad; if deficient, not a dollar of gold will come in to supply the lack. There is no Legislature on earth wise enough to adjust such a currency to the wants of the country.

Let us examine more minutely the effect of such a currency upon prices. Suppose that the business transactions of the country at the present time require \$350,000,000 in gold. It is manifest that if there are just \$350,000,000 of legal-tender notes, and no other money in the country, each dollar will perform the full functions of a gold dollar, so far as the work of exchange is concerned. Now, business remaining the same, let \$350,000,000 more of the same kind of notes be pressed into circulation. The whole volume, as thus increased, can do no more than all the business. Each dollar will accomplish just half the work that a dollar did before the increase; but as the nominal dollar is fixed by law, the effect is shown in prices being doubled. It requires two of these dollars to make the same purchase that one dollar made before the increase. It would require

some time for the business of the country to adjust itself to the new conditions, and great derangement of values would ensue; but the result would at last be reached in all transactions which are controlled by the law of demand and supply.

No such change of values can occur without cost. Somebody must pay for it. Who pays in this case? We have seen that doubling the currency finally results in reducing the purchasing power of each dollar one half; hence every man who held a legal-tender note at the time of the increase, and continued to hold it till the full effect of the increase was produced, suffered a loss of fifty per cent. of its value; in other words, he paid a tax to the amount of half of all the currency in his possession. This new issue, therefore, by depreciating the value of all the currency, cost the holders of the old issue \$175,000,000; and if the new notes were received at their nominal value at the date of issue, their holders paid a tax of \$175,000,000 more. No more unequal or unjust mode of taxation could possibly be devised. It would be tolerated only by being so involved in the transactions of business as to be concealed from observation; but it would be no less real because hidden.

But some one may say: "This depreciation would fall upon capitalists and rich men, who are able to bear it."

If this were true, it would be no less unjust. But, unfortunately, the capitalists would suffer less than any other class. The new issue would be paid in the first place in large amounts to the creditors of the Government; it would pass from their hands before the depreciation had taken full effect, and, passing down step by step through the ranks of middlemen, the dead weight would fall at last upon the laboring classes in the increased price of all the necessities of life. It is well known that in a general rise of prices wages are among the last to rise. This principle was illustrated in the report of the Special Commissioner of the Revenue for the year 1866. It is there shown that from the beginning of the war to the end of 1866, the average price of all commodities had risen ninety per cent. Wages, however, had risen but sixty per cent. A day's labor would purchase but two thirds as many of

the necessities of life as it would before. The wrong is therefore inflicted on the laborer long before his income can be adjusted to his increased expenses. It was in view of this truth that Daniel Webster said, in one of his ablest speeches:

Of all the contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind, none has been more effectual than that which deludes them with paper money. This is the most effectual of inventions to fertilize the rich man's field by the sweat of the poor man's brow. Ordinary tyranny, oppression, excessive taxation, these bear lightly on the happiness of the mass of the community, compared with a fraudulent currency and the robberies committed by depreciated paper.

The fraud committed and the burdens imposed upon the people, in the case we have supposed, would be less intolerable if all business transactions could be really adjusted to the new conditions; but even this is impossible. All debts would be canceled, all contracts fulfilled by payment in these notes—not at their real value, but for their face. All salaries fixed by law, the pay of every soldier in the army, of every sailor in the navy, and all pensions and bounties, would be reduced to half their former value. In these cases the effect is only injurious. Let it never be forgotten that every depreciation of our currency results in robbing the one hundred and eighty thousand pensioners, maimed heroes, crushed and bereaved widows, and homeless orphans, who sit helpless at our feet. And who would be benefited by this policy? A pretense of apology might be offered for it, if the Government could save what the people lose. But the system lacks the support of even that selfish and immoral consideration. The depreciation caused by the overissue in the case we have supposed, compels the Government to pay just that per cent. more on all the contracts it makes, on all the loans it negotiates, on all the supplies it purchases; and to crown all, it must at last redeem all its legal-tender notes in gold coin, dollar for dollar. The advocates of repudiation have not yet been bold enough to deny this.

I have thus far considered the influence of a redundant paper currency on the country when its trade and industry are in a healthy and normal state. I now call atten-

tion to its effect in producing an unhealthy expansion of business, in stimulating speculation and extravagance, and in laying the sure foundation of commercial revulsion and widespread ruin. This principle is too well understood to require any elaboration here. The history of all modern nations is full of examples. One of the ablest American writers on banks and banking, Mr. Gouge, thus sums up the result of his researches:

The history of all our bank pressures and panics has been the same in 1825, in 1837, and in 1843; and the cause is given in these two simple words—universal expansion.

There still remains to be considered the effect of depreciated currency on our trade with other nations. By raising prices at home higher than they are abroad, imports are largely increased beyond the exports; our coin must go abroad; or, what is far worse for us, our bonds, which have also suffered depreciation, and are purchased by foreigners at seventy cents on the dollar. During the whole period of high prices occasioned by the war, gold and bonds have been steadily going abroad, notwithstanding our tariff duties, which average nearly fifty per cent. *ad valorem*. More than five hundred million dollars of our bonds are now held in Europe, ready to be thrown back upon us when any war or other sufficient disturbance shall occur. No tariff rates short of actual prohibition can prevent this outflow of gold while our currency is thus depreciated. During these years, also, our merchant marine steadily decreased, and our ship-building interests were nearly ruined.

Our tonnage engaged in foreign trade, which amounted in 1859-'60 to more than two and a half million tons, had fallen in 1865-'66 to less than one and a half millions—a decrease of more than fifty per cent.; and prices of labor and material are still too high to enable our shipwrights to compete with foreign builders.

From the facts already exhibited in reference to our industrial revolution, and from the foregoing analysis of the nature and functions of currency, it is manifest:

1. That the remarkable prosperity of all industrial enterprise during the war was not

caused by the abundance of currency, but by the unparalleled demand for every product of labor.

2. That the great depression of business, the stagnation of trade, the "hard times" which have prevailed during the past year, and which still prevail, have not been caused by an insufficient amount of currency, but mainly by the great falling off of the demand for all the products of labor compared with the increased supply since the return from war to peace.

I should be satisfied to rest on these propositions without further argument, were it not that the declaration is so often and so confidently made by members of this House, that there is not only no excess of currency, but that there is not enough for the business of the country. I subjoin a table, carefully made up from the official records, showing the amount of paper money in the United States at the beginning of each year from 1834 to 1868 inclusive. The fractions of millions are omitted:

1834, \$95,000,000	1852, \$150,000,000
1835, 104,000,000	1853, 146,000,000
1836, 140,000,000	1854, 205,000,000
1837, 149,000,000	1855, 187,000,000
1838, 116,000,000	1856, 196,000,000
1839, 135,000,000	1857, 215,000,000
1840, 107,000,000	1858, 135,000,000
1841, 107,000,000	1859, 193,000,000
1842, 84,000,000	1860, 207,000,000
1843, 59,000,000	1861, 202,000,000
1844, 75,000,000	1862, 218,000,000
1845, 90,000,000	1863, 529,000,000
1846, 105,000,000	1864, 636,000,000
1847, 106,000,000	1865, 948,000,000
1848, 129,000,000	1866, 919,000,000
1849, 115,000,000	1867, 852,000,000
1850, 131,000,000	1868, 767,000,000
1851, 155,000,000	

To obtain a full exhibit of the circulating medium of the country for these years, it would be necessary to add to the above the amount of coin in circulation each year. This amount can not be ascertained with accuracy; but it is the opinion of those best qualified to judge, that there were about two hundred million dollars of gold and silver coin in the United States at the beginning of the rebellion. It is officially known that the amount held by the banks from 1860 to 1863 inclusive averaged about ninety-seven million dollars. Including bank reserves, the total circulation of coin and

paper never exceeded four hundred million dollars before the war. Excluding the bank reserves, the amount was never much above three hundred million dollars. During the twenty-six years preceding the war the average bank circulation was less than one hundred and thirty-nine million dollars.

It is estimated that the amount of coin now in the United States is not less than \$250,000,000. When it is remembered that there are \$106,000,000 of coin in the Treasury, that customs duties and interest on the public debt are paid in coin alone, and that the currency of the States and Territories of the Pacific coast is wholly metallic, it will be seen that a large sum of gold and silver must be added to the volume of paper currency in order to ascertain the whole amount of our circulation. It can not be successfully controverted that the gold, silver, and paper, used as money in this country at this time, amount to \$1,000,000,000. If we subtract from this amount our bank reserves, which amounted on the 1st of January last to \$162,500,000, and also the cash in the national Treasury, which at that time amounted to \$134,000,000, we still have left in active circulation more than \$700,000,000.

It rests with those who assert that our present amount of currency is insufficient, to show that one hundred and fifty per cent. more currency is now needed for the business of the country than was needed in 1860. To escape this difficulty, it has been asserted, by some honorable members, that the country never had currency enough; and that credit was substituted before the war to supply the lack of money. It is a perfect answer to this, that in many of the States a system of free banking prevailed; and such banks pushed into circulation all the money they could find a market for.

The table I have submitted shows how perfect an index the currency is of the healthy or unhealthy condition of business, and that every great financial crisis, during the period covered by the table, has been preceded by a great increase, and followed by a great and sudden decrease, in the volume of paper money. The rise and fall of mercury in the barometer is not more surely indicative of an atmospheric storm, than is a sudden increase or decrease of currency

indicative of financial disaster. Within the period covered by the table there were four great financial and commercial crises in this country. They occurred in 1837, 1841, 1854, and 1857. Now observe the change in the volume of paper currency for those years.

On the first day of January, 1837, the amount had risen to \$149,000,000, an increase of nearly fifty per cent. in three years. Before the end of that year, the reckless expansion, speculation, and overtrading which caused the increase, had resulted in terrible collapse; and on the 1st of January, 1838, the volume was reduced to \$116,000,000. Wild lands, which speculation had raised to fifteen and twenty dollars per acre, fell to one dollar and a half and two dollars, accompanied by a corresponding depression in all branches of business. Immediately after the crisis of 1841, the bank circulation decreased twenty-five per cent., and by the end of 1842 was reduced to \$58,500,000, a decrease of nearly fifty per cent.

At the beginning of 1853 the amount was \$146,000,000. Speculation and expansion had swelled it to \$205,000,000 by the end of that year, and thus introduced the crash of 1854. At the beginning of 1857 the paper money of the country reached its highest point of inflation up to that time. There were nearly \$215,000,000, but at the end of that disastrous year the volume had fallen to \$135,000,000, a decrease of nearly forty per cent. in less than twelve months. In the great crashes preceding 1837 the same conditions are invariably seen—great expansion, followed by a violent collapse, not only in paper money, but in loans and discounts; and those manifestations have always been accompanied by a corresponding fluctuation in prices.

In the great crash of 1819, one of the severest this country ever suffered, there was a complete prostration of business. It is recorded in Niles's Register for 1820 that, in that year, an Ohio miller sold four barrels of flour to raise five dollars, the amount of his subscription to that paper. Wheat was twenty cents per bushel, and corn ten cents. About the same time, Mr. Jefferson wrote to Nathaniel Macon:

We have now no standard of value. I am

asked eighteen dollars for a yard of broadcloth which, when we had dollars, I used to get for eighteen shillings.

But there is one quality of such a currency more remarkable than all others—its strange power to delude men. The spells and enchantments of legendary witchcraft were hardly so wonderful. Most delusions can not be repeated; they lose their power after a full exposure. Not so with irredeemable paper money. From the days of John Law its history has been a repetition of the same story, with only this difference: no nation now resorts to its use except from overwhelming necessity; but whenever any nation is fairly embarked, it floats on the delusive waves, and, like the lotus-eating companions of Ulysses, wishes to return no more.

Into this very delusion many of our fellow citizens and many members of this House have fallen. Hardly a member of either House of the Thirty-seventh or Thirty-eighth Congress spoke on the subject who did not deplore the necessity of resorting to inconvertible paper money, and protest against its continuance a single day beyond the inexorable necessities of the war. The remarks of Mr. Fessenden, when he reported the first legal-tender bill from the Finance Committee of the Senate, in February, 1862, fully exhibit the sentiment of Congress at that time. He assured the country that the measure was not to be resorted to as a policy; that it was what it professed to be, a temporary expedient; that he agreed with the declaration of the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means of the House that it was not contemplated to issue more than \$150,000,000 of legal-tender notes.

This, I repeat, was the almost unanimous sentiment of the Thirty-seventh Congress; and though subsequent necessity compelled both that and the Thirty-eighth Congress to make new issues of paper, yet the danger was always confessed and the policy and purpose of speedy resumption were kept steadily in view. So anxious were the members of the Thirty-eighth Congress that the temptation to new issues should not overcome them or their successors, that they bound themselves, by a kind of financial temperance pledge, that there never should be a further increase of legal-tender notes.

Witness the following clause of the loan act of June 30, 1864 :

SECTION 2. . . . *Provided*, That the total amount of bonds and Treasury notes authorized by the first and second sections of this act shall not exceed \$400,000,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore issued; nor shall the total amount of United States notes, issued or to be issued, ever exceed \$400,000,000, and such additional sum, not exceeding \$50,000,000, as may be temporarily required for the redemption of temporary loan.

Here is a solemn pledge to the public creditors, a compact with them, that the Government will never issue non-interest-paying notes beyond the sum total of \$450,000,000. When the war ended, the Thirty-ninth Congress, adopting the views of its predecessors on this subject, regarded the legal-tender currency as a part of the war machinery, and proceeded to reduce and withdraw it in the same manner in which the army and navy and other accompaniments of the war were reduced. Ninety-five gentlemen who now occupy seats in this Hall were members of this House on the 18th of December, 1865, when it was resolved, by a vote of 144 yeas to 6 nays :

That this House cordially concurs in the views of the Secretary of the Treasury in relation to the necessity of a contraction of the currency with a view to as early a resumption of specie payments as the business interests of the country, will permit; and we hereby pledge cooperative action to this end as speedily as practicable.

Since the passage of that resolution the currency has been reduced by an amount less than one sixth of its volume, and what magic wonders have been wrought in the opinions of members of this House and among the financial philosophers of the country! A score of honorable gentlemen have exhausted their eloquence in singing the praises of greenbacks. They insist that, at the very least, Congress should at once set the printing-presses in motion to restore the \$70,000,000 of national treasure so ruthlessly reduced to ashes by the incendiary torch of the Secretary of the Treasury. Another, claiming that this would be a poor and meager offering to the offended paper god, introduces a bill to print and issue

\$140,000,000 more. The philosopher of Lewiston, the Democratic Representative of the Ninth District of Illinois [Mr. Ross], thinks that a new issue of \$700,000,000 will, for the present, meet the wants of the country. Another, perceiving that the national-bank notes are dividing the honors with greenbacks, proposes to abolish these offending corporations, and, in lieu of their notes, issue \$300,000,000 more in greenbacks, and thus increase the active circulation by over one hundred millions, the amount now held as bank reserves. And, finally, the Democratic masses of the West are rallying under the leadership of the coming man, the young statesman of Cincinnati, who proposes to cancel with greenbacks the \$1,500,000,000 of five - twenty bonds, and, with his election to the Presidency, usher in the full millennial glory of paper money! And this is the same George H. Pendleton who denounced as unconstitutional the law which authorized the first issue of greenbacks, and concluded an elaborate speech against the passage of the bill in 1862 with these words :

You send these notes out into the world stamped with irredeemability. You put on them the mark of Cain, and, like Cain, they will go forth to be vagabonds and fugitives on the earth. What, then, will be the consequence? It requires no prophet to tell what will be their history. The currency will be expanded; prices will be inflated; fixed values will depreciate; incomes will be diminished; the savings of the poor will vanish; the hoardings of the widow will melt away; bonds, mortgages, and notes, everything of fixed value, will lose their value; everything of changeable value will be appreciated; the necessities of life will rise in value. . . . Contraction will follow. Private ruin and public bankruptcy, either with or without REPUDIATION, will inevitably follow.

The chief cause of this new-born zeal for paper money is the same as that which led a member of the Continental Congress to exclaim :

Do you think, gentlemen, that I will consent to load my constituents with taxes, when we can send to the printer and get a wagon-load of money, one quire of which will pay for the whole?

The simple fact in the case is that Congress went resolutely and almost unanimous-

ly forward in the policy of gradual resumption of specie payments and a return to the old standard of values, until the pressure of falling prices and hard times began to be felt, and now many are shrinking from the good work they have undertaken, are turning back from the path they so worthily resolved to pursue, and are asking Congress to plunge the nation deeper than ever into the abyss from which it has been struggling so earnestly to escape. Did any reflecting man suppose it possible for the country to return from the high prices, the enormous expansion of business, debt, and speculation occasioned by the war, without much depression and temporary distress? The wit of man has never devised a method by which the vast commercial and industrial interests of a nation can suffer the change from peace to war, and from war back to peace, without hardship and loss. The homely old maxim, "What goes up must come down," applies to our situation with peculiar force. The "coming down" is inevitable. Congress can only break the fall and mitigate its evils by adjusting the taxation, the expenditures, and the currency of the country to the changed conditions of affairs. This it is our duty to do with a firm and steady hand.

Much of this work has already been done. Our national expenditures have been very considerably reduced, but the work of retrenching expenditures can go, and should go, much further. Very many, perhaps too many, of our national taxes have been removed. But if this Congress shall consent to break down the dikes, and let in on the country a new flood of paper money for the temporary relief of business, we shall see all the evils of our present situation return after a few months with redoubled force.

It is my clear conviction that the most formidable danger with which the country is now threatened is a large increase in the volume of paper money.

Shall we learn nothing from experience? Shall the warnings of the past be unheeded? What other nation has so painfully spelled out, letter by letter and word by word, the terrible meaning of irredeemable paper money, whether known by the name of colonial bills, Continental currency, or notes of dishonored banks? Most of the colonies

had suffered untold evils from depreciated paper before the Revolution. Massachusetts issued her first bills of credit in 1690, to meet a war debt, and, after sixty years of vain and delusive efforts to make worthless paper serve the purposes of money, found her industry perishing under the weight of colony bills equal in nominal value to \$11,000,000, which, though made a legal tender and braced up by the severest laws, were worth but twelve per cent. of their face; and, under the lead of Hutchinson, a far-sighted and courageous statesman, in 1750 resumed specie payment, canceled all her bills, and by law prohibited the circulation of paper money within her borders, and made it a crime punishable by a fine of £100 for any Governor to approve any bill to make it a legal tender.

For the next quarter of a century Massachusetts enjoyed the blessings of a sound currency. Rhode Island clung to the delusion many years longer. More than one hundred pages of Arnold's history of that colony are devoted to portraying the distress and confusion resulting from this cause alone. The history of every colony that issued bills is a repetition of the same sad story.

The financial history of the Revolution is too familiar to need repetition here, but there are points in that history of which an American Congress can not be too often reminded. Nowhere else were all the qualities of irredeemable paper money so fully exhibited. From the first emission of \$2,000,000, in 1775, till the last, in 1781, when \$360,000,000 had been issued, there appeared to be a purpose, perpetually renewed but always broken, to restrict the amount and issue no more. Each issue was to be the last. But notwithstanding the enormous volume reluctantly put in circulation, our fathers seemed to believe that its value could be kept up by legislation. They denounced in resolutions of Congress the first depreciation of these bills as the work of enemies; and in January, 1776, resolved:

That if any person shall hereafter be so lost to all virtue and regard for his country as to refuse to receive said bills in payment, etc., he shall be treated as an enemy, and precluded from all trade or intercourse with the inhabitants of these colonies.

But they found before the struggle ended that the inexorable laws of value were above human legislation; that resolutions can not nullify the truths of the multiplication table.

The bills passed nearly at par until the issues exceeded nine millions. At the end of 1776 they were worth seventy-five per cent. of their nominal value; at the end of 1777, twenty-five; at the end of 1778, sixteen; at the end of 1779, two and a half; and at the end of 1780 they were worth but one cent on the dollar. Four months later \$500 in Continental bills were selling for one dollar in specie. Peletiah Webster, in 1790, said:

The fatal error that the credit and currency of Continental money could be kept up and supported by acts of compulsion, entered so deep in the minds of Congress and all departments of administration through the States, that no consideration of justice, religion, or policy, or even experience of its utter inefficiency, could eradicate it; it seemed a kind of obstinate delirium, totally deaf to every argument drawn from justice and right, from its natural tendency and mischief, and from common justice, and even from common sense. . . . This ruinous principle was continued in practice for five successive years, and appeared in all shapes and forms, i e., legal-tender acts, limitation of prices, in awful and threatening declarations, and in penal laws. . . . Many thousand families of full and easy fortune were ruined by these fatal measures, and lie in ruins to-day (1790), without the least benefit to the country or to the great and noble cause in which they were then engaged.

In summing up the evils of the Continental currency, after speaking of the terrible hardships of the war, the destruction of property by the enemy, who at times during its progress held eleven out of the thirteen State capitals, Mr. Webster, who had seen it all, said:

Yet these evils were not as great as those which were caused by Continental money and the consequent irregularities of the financial system. We have suffered from this cause more than from every other cause of calamity; it has killed more men, pervaded and corrupted the choicest interests of our country more, and done more injustice, than even the arms and artifices of our enemies.

But let it never be forgotten that the

fathers of the Revolution saw, at last, the fatal error into which they had fallen, and even in the midst of their great trials restored to the young nation then struggling for its existence its standard of value, its basis for honest and honorable industry.

In 1781, Robert Morris was appointed Superintendent of Finance. He made a return to specie payments the condition of his acceptance; and, on the 22d of May, Congress declared, "That the calculation of the expenses of the present campaign shall be made in solid coin"; and—

That experience having evinced the inefficiency of all attempts to support the credit of paper money by compulsory acts, it is recommended to such States where laws making paper bills a tender yet exist to repeal the same.

Thus were the financial interests of the nation rescued from dishonor and utter ruin.

The state of the currency from the close of the war to the establishment of the Government under the Constitution was most deplorable. The separate States had been seized with the mania for paper money, and were rivaling each other in the extravagance of their issues and the rigor of their financial laws. One by one they were able, at last, to conquer the evils into which paper money had plunged them. In 1786 James Madison wrote from Richmond, to General Washington, the joyful news that the Virginia Legislature had, by a majority of 84 to 17, voted—

Paper money unjust, impolitic, destructive of public and private confidence, and of that virtue which is the basis of republican government.

The paper money of Massachusetts was the chief cause of Shays's rebellion. The paper money of Rhode Island kept that State for several years from coming into the Union.

Nearly half a century afterward, Daniel Webster, reviewing the financial history of the period now under consideration, said:

From the close of the war to the time of the adoption of this Constitution, as I verily believe, the people suffered as much, except in loss of life, from the disordered state of the currency and the prostration of commerce and business as they suffered during the war.

With such an experience, it is not wonderful that the framers of our Constitution should have undertaken to protect their descendants from the evils they had themselves endured.

By reference to the Madison Papers, volume three, pages 1343-'46, it will be seen that, in the first draft of the Constitution, there was a clause giving Congress the power "to borrow money and emit bills on the credit of the United States."

On the 16th of August, 1787, during the final revision, Gouverneur Morris moved to strike out the clause authorizing the emission of bills. Mr. Madison declared that he voted to strike it out so as to "cut off the pretext for a paper currency, and particularly for making the bills a tender either for public or private debts." Mr. Ellsworth "thought this a favorable time to shut and bar the door against paper money. The mischief of the various experiments which had been made was now fresh in the public mind, and had excited the disgust of all the respectable part of America." Mr. Read "thought that the words, if not struck out, would be as alarming as the mark of the Beast in Revelation." Mr. Langdon had rather reject the whole "plan than retain the three words 'and emit bills.'"

The clause was stricken out by a vote of nine States to two. Twelve days later, Roger Sherman, remarking that "this is a favorable crisis for crushing paper money," moved "to prohibit the States from emitting bills of credit, or making anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts." This clause was placed in the Constitution by a vote of eight States to two. Thus our fathers supposed they had protected us against the very evil which now afflicts the nation.

X.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY ARRAIGNED AT THE BAR OF PUBLIC OPINION.

*Speech at the Republican Mass Meeting in
Cleveland, Saturday Evening, October
11, 1879.*

FELLOW CITIZENS: The distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me have covered the ground so completely and so ad-

mirably that I have a very easy task. I will pick up a few straws here and there over the broad field, and ask you for a few moments to look at them. I take it for granted that every thoughtful, intelligent man would be glad, if he could, to be on the right side, believing that in the long run the right side will be the strong side. I take it for granted that every man would like to hold political opinions that will live some time, if he could. It is a very awkward thing indeed to adopt a political opinion, and trust to it, and find that it will not live over night. It would be an exceedingly awkward thing to go to bed alone with your political doctrine, trusting and believing in it, thinking it is true, and wake up in the morning and find it a corpse in your arms.

I should be glad, for my part, to hold to a political doctrine that would live all through summer, and stand the frost, and stand a freeze in the winter, and come out alive and true in the spring. I should like to adopt political doctrines that would live longer than my dog. I should be glad to hold to a political doctrine that would live longer than I shall live, and that my children after me might believe in as true, and say: "This doctrine is true to-day, and it was true fifty years ago, when my father adopted it."

Every great political party that has done this country any good has given to it some immortal ideas that have outlived all the members of that party. The old Federal party gave great, permanent ideas to this country that are still alive. The old Whig party did the same. The old, the very old, Democratic party did the same—the party of Andrew Jackson, Benton, and Calhoun. But the modern Democratic party has given this country in the last twenty years no idea that has lived to be four years old. I mean an idea, not a passion. The Democratic party has had passions that have lasted longer than that. They have had an immortal appetite for office. That is just as strong to-day as it was twenty years ago. Somebody has called the Democratic party "an organized appetite." But that is not an idea; that is of the belly, and not of the heart, nor of the brain. I say again, they have given to

this country no great national idea or doctrine that has lived to be four years old; and if we had in this great park, as in a great field, herded here together all the ideas that the Democratic party has uttered and put forth in the last twenty years, there would not be found a four-year-old in the lot—hardly a three-year-old—hardly a two-year-old. They have adopted a doctrine just to last till election was over; and if it did not succeed, they have dropped it to try another; and they have tried another until it failed, and then tried another; and it has been a series of mere trials to catch success. Whenever they have started in a campaign, they have looked out to all the political barns to see how the tin roosters were pointing, to learn from the political weather-cocks which way the wind is likely to blow; and then they have made their doctrines accordingly. This is no slander of the Democratic party. As my friend Mr. Foster has said, this is true not so much of the body of the party as of the leaders. What a dance they have put the good, sound, quiet, steady-going Democrat through during the last twenty years! They made him denounce our war for a long time; and then, when it was all over, they made him praise it. They made him vote with a party that called our soldiers "Lincoln's hirelings," and "Lincoln's dogs"; and this very day one of the men who did that is parading up and down this State, praising the Democratic party because it has two soldiers at the head of its ticket, and sneering at us because Mr. Foster was not a soldier in the field.

That party has taken both sides of every great question in this country in the last twenty years. They are in favor of the war—after it is over. They are in favor of hard money—or they will be next year, after it is an accomplished fact. They were opposed to greenbacks when greenbacks were necessary to save the life of the nation, and when they thought it would be popular to oppose greenbacks. The moment they found it was unpopular they faced the other way, and declared that the greenback was the best currency the world ever saw.

I would like to ask that good, old, quiet Democrat how he has felt when they have told him to vote against the war one year

and then praise it the next, and he had to follow his leaders all the while, how he felt when they told him to curse greenbacks, and he voted the ticket, and then when they ordered him to wheel right around on his heel and march the other way, and vote the Democratic ticket all the time. They told him, for example, that the proposition to let the negro have his freedom was an outrageous thing that must not be listened to, and he voted the Democratic ticket. A little while after, they came around and said: "We will enforce all the amendments of the Constitution—the negro amendment among the rest—and we are among the best friends that the negro ever had." And yet he voted with them every time, facing right the other way. When we proposed to give the ballot to the negro, they said: "Why, he is an inferior race. God made him to be a hewer of wood and a drawer of water. He is inferior to us. He is of bad odor, and bad every way, of low intelligence, and we will never, never allow him to vote." What do they say now? They are cooing and billing with every negro that will listen to them, and asking him to vote the Democratic ticket. They are saying to him: "My friend, the Democratic party was always a good friend of the negro. The Democratic party knows the negro better than the Republicans do. We have been nearer to you. We know your habits. We understand your character, and we can do you more good." Yes, they have been nearer to you. The fellow that flogs you with a cat-o'-nine-tails has to be pretty near to you. They have a warm feeling for you. The man who brands your cheek with a red-hot iron gets up a good deal of warmth toward you.

But, my friends, the curious thing is, how a steady-going, consistent Democrat can have followed all these crooks and turns and facings-about of his party in all these years, and not have gotten dizzy by turning so frequently. They shouted for hard money, and he voted the Democratic ticket. They shouted for soft money, and he voted the Democratic ticket. They said the three amendments to the Constitution were void, and should not be obeyed, and he voted the Democratic ticket. They walked right out to the next great election bringing Horace

Greeley in their arms, and said, "We will carry out all the amendments to the Constitution; we will be the best friend of the slave in the world," and he voted the Democratic ticket, following in the same wake.

Now, my friends, there has not been a leading prophecy, there has not been a leading doctrine put forward by the Democratic party in all these years that it has not itself abandoned. I do not believe there is a fair-minded Democrat here to-night who does not rejoice in his soul that his party has abandoned the leading doctrines of the last twenty years. Are you sorry, my Democratic friend, that slavery is dead? I believe you are not. Then you are glad that we outvoted you when you tried to keep it alive. Are you sorry that rebellion and secession are dead? If you are not, then you are glad that you were overwhelmed and outvoted when you tried to keep the party that sustained them alive. Are you glad that our war was not a failure? If you are, you are glad that we voted you down in 1864, when your central doctrine was that the war was a failure and must be stopped. If you are glad of so many things, will you not be glad when we have voted down your party next Tuesday and elected Charley Foster Governor of Ohio?

There are two great reasons why the people of this State are going to do it. One is, that they do not intend to allow any more fooling with the business of this country. For the last four years the chief obstacle in the way of the restoration of business prosperity and the full employment of labor in this country has been the danger threatened to you by the politicians in Congress. Business has waited to awaken. Prosperity has been trying to come. General Ewing tells us that it is Divine Providence and a good crop that brought revival of business this year. I remind General Ewing that we had a bountiful crop last year, and business did not revive. I remind him that the year before was a year of great harvest and plenty, and prosperity did not come.

Do you know that when we commenced this campaign, General Ewing began to preach his old sermon of last year—his gospel of gloom, and darkness, and distress, and misery; and some of his friends said: "But

see here, Ewing, the furnaces are aflame; the mills are busy. It will not do to talk that these people are all in distress." And for a week or two Mr. Ewing denied that there was any revival of business. He denied it flatly. But every mill roared in his ears, and every furnace and forge flashed in his eyes the truth that there was a revival of business; and then for about four days he undertook to say that it was a campaign dodge of the Republican party; that they started up a few iron-mills until election to affect the election. But that would not work, for Democratic States began to start their iron-mills, rebel States began to boom in business, and that second explanation of Mr. Ewing's would not work. Then he undertook, and is yet undertaking, to explain this prosperity away. I heard a gentleman lately tell an incident that illustrates this futile attempt of Mr. Ewing. England wanted Garibaldi to be married to some distinguished English lady, so as to ally free Italy to England. They got it well talked up in diplomatic circles; but finally some unfortunate fellow suggested a fact that disturbed their calculations. It was that Garibaldi was married; that he had a young, healthy wife, likely to outlive him. The old diplomatists, not to be balked by any obstacles, said: "Never mind; we will get Gladstone to explain her away." Gladstone is a very able man, but when he attempts to explain away as real a thing as a woman, and a wife at that, he undertakes a great contract. Thomas Ewing is not any abler than Gladstone, and his attempt to explain away this prosperity of our country will be more disastrous than the attempt of Gladstone would have been if he had made it. Everywhere he goes it meets him.

Pig-iron in this country, the lowest form of the iron product, has risen in price almost thirteen dollars the ton since resumption came; and all industries depending upon it have risen in proportion. My only fear, and I say it to the business men around me to-night, is that the revival of business is coming too fast, and that we may overdo it and bring a reaction by and by. But that prosperity has come, and, if we do not abuse it, has come to stay, I have no doubt. I do not claim that the resumption

of specie payments has done it all. I admit that the favorable balance of trade, that the operation of our tariff laws, that our own great crops and the failure of crops in Europe have done much to secure and aid this revival of business.

But there is an element in this revival distinctly and markedly traceable to the resumption of specie payments, and I ask your indulgence for a half a minute to state it.

All over this country there was hidden away in the hands of private men, in stocking-feet, in tills, in safes, capital that they dared not invest. Why? Because they did not know what Congress would do; whether it would vote their prosperity up or down, whether the wild vagaries of fiat money should rule, or whether the old God-made dollar of the Constitution and the fathers, the hundred-cent dollar, the dollar all round, should come to be our standard or not; and they waited. But the moment our Government, in spite of the Democratic party, in spite of the fiat-money party, in spite of all croakers of all parties, resolved to redeem the great war promises of the nation, and lift our currency up to be as good as gold the world over, that moment the great needed restoration of confidence came; and when it came, capital came out of its hiding-places and invested itself in business. And that investment, that confidence, that stability, gave the grand and needed impetus to the restoration of prosperity in this country.

Now, what has been the trouble with us? 1860 was one shore of prosperity, and 1879 the other; and between those two high shores has flowed the broad, deep, dark river of fire and blood and disaster through which this nation has been compelled to wade, and in whose depths it has been almost suffocated and drowned. In the darkness of that terrible passage we carried liberty in our arms; we bore the Union on our shoulders; and we bore in our hearts and on our arms what was even better than liberty and Union—we bore the faith, and honor, and public trust of this mighty nation. And never, until we came up out of the dark waters, out of the darkness of that terrible current, and planted our feet upon the solid shore of 1879—never, I say, till then could this country look back to the

other shore and feel that its feet were on solid ground, and then look forward to the rising uplands of perpetual peace and prosperity that should know no diminution in the years to come.

I rejoice, for my part, that the party to which I belong has not been fighting against God in this struggle for prosperity. I rejoice that the party to which I belong has not had its prospects hurt by the coming of prosperity. Can you say as much, my Democratic friend, for your party? Would it not have been better for you at the polls next Tuesday if the blight had fallen upon our great corn crop, if the Colorado beetle had swept every potato field in America, if the early frost had smitten us all? Don't you think Mr. Ewing could then have talked more eloquently about the grief, and suffering, and outrage, and hard times brought upon you by the Republican policy of resumption? I should be ashamed to belong to a political party whose prospects were hurt by the blessing of my country.

But so it was all during the war. Just before election any time in Ohio during the war, a great battle that won a victory over the rebellion hurt the Democratic party in this State, and they walked about our streets looking down their noses in sadness and gloom, recognizing that their ballots would be fewer on election day because of the success of our arms; and if our soldiers were overwhelmed in battle, if five thousand of your children were slaughtered on the field by the enemies of the Republic, the Democrats in Ohio walked more confidently to the polls on election day, and said: "Didn't I tell you so?" There is something wrong with a party about which those things could be truthfully said; and you know that they are the truth.

Now, I leave all that with this single reflection: that it is to me for my party a matter of pride and congratulation that in all the darkness of these years we have not deceived you by any cunning device to flatter your passions or your hopes. We have told you these are hard times; we are in the midst of suffering, and there is no patent process by which you can get out of it. You can not print yourselves rich. You have got to suffer and be strong. You have got to

endure and be economical. You have got to wait in patience and do justice, keep your pledges, keep your promises, obey the laws, and by and by prosperity will come with its blessings upon you. We have now nothing to take back. We rejoice that we were true to you in the days of darkness, and we congratulate you that you have stood by the truth until your hour of triumph has come.

I said there were two reasons why I thought we would triumph next Tuesday. I have hinted at one; I will now speak briefly of the other. I mean to say that the great audiences that have gathered everywhere in Ohio during this campaign have had more than finance in their hearts. They have thought of something as much higher than finance, as liberty is more precious than cash. They have been moved—and I ask all Democrats to hear it with patience—by what I venture to call the new rebellion against liberty and this Government. I do not mean a rebellion with guns, for I think that was tried to the heart's content of the people that undertook it. Not that, but another one no less wicked in purpose and no less dangerous in character. Let me try in a few words, if it be possible to reach all this vast audience, to make you understand what I mean by this new rebellion.

Fellow citizens, what is the central thought in American life? What is the germ out of which all our institutions were born, and have been developed? Let me give it to you in a word. When the Mayflower was about to land her precious freight upon the shore of Plymouth, the Pilgrim Fathers gathered in the cabin of that little ship, on a stormy November day, and, after praying to Almighty God for the success of their great enterprise, drew up and signed what is known in history, and what will be known to the last syllable of recorded time, as "the Pilgrim Covenant." In that Covenant is one sentence which I ask you to take home with you to-night. It is this: "We agree before God and each other that the freely expressed will of the majority shall be the law of all, which we will all obey." [Applause.] Ah, fellow citizens, it does honor to the heads and the hearts of a great New England audience here, on this Western Reserve, to applaud the grand and

simple sentiment of the Pilgrim Fathers. They said: "No standing army shall be needed to make us obey. We will erect here in America a substitute for monarchy, a substitute for despotism, and that substitute shall be the will of the majority as the law of all." And that germ, planted on the rocky shores of New England, has sprung up, and all the trees of our liberty have grown from it into the beauty and glory of this year of our life.

Over against that there grew up in the South a spirit in absolute antagonism to the "Pilgrim Covenant." That spirit, engendered by the institution of slavery, became one of the most powerful and despotic of all the forces on the face of this globe.

Let me state, even as an apology for that tyranny—if you and I owned a powder mill in the city of Cleveland, we would have a right to make some very stringent and arbitrary rules about that powder mill. We would have a right to say that no man should enter it who had nails in the heels of his boots, because a single step might explode it, and ruin us all. But that would be an absurd law to make about your own house or about a greengrocer's shop.

Now, the establishment of the institution of slavery required laws and customs absolutely tyrannical in their character. Nails in the heels of your boots in a powder magazine would be safety compared with letting education into slavery. It was an institution that would be set on fire by the torch of knowledge, and they knew it; and therefore they said, "The shining gates of knowledge shall be shut everywhere where a slave lives. It shall be a crime to teach a black man the alphabet; a crime greater still to teach him the living oracles of Almighty God; for if once the golden rule of Christ finds its way into the heart of a negro man, and he learns the literature of liberty, our institution is in danger." Hence the whole Southern people became a disciplined, banded, absolute despotism over the politics of their section. They had to be. I do not blame them. I only blame the system that compelled them to be so. Now, therefore, all before the war the Southern people were the best disciplined politicians in this world. They were organized on the one

great idea of protecting their Southern society with slavery at its center. Do you know the power of discipline? Here is a vast audience of ten or fifteen thousand people in this square, and you are not organized. One resolute captain with one hundred resolute, disciplined soldiers, such as stormed the heights of Kenesaw, could sweep through this square and drive us all out hither and thither at their pleasure. And that is nothing against our courage. It is in favor of their discipline. The clinched fist of Southern slaveholders was too much for the great, bulky, proud strength of the North. They went to Washington, consolidated for one purpose, and they called all their fellows around them from the North, and said, "Give way to our doctrine, and you have our friendship and support. Go against us at all, and we rule you out of place and power." The result was that the Southern politicians absolutely commanded and controlled their Northern allies. They converted the Northern Democrats into doughfaces of the most abject pattern; and you know here to-night, if there be a Democrat who listens to me, that the Republican party was born as a protest against the tyranny of that Southern political hierarchy that made slaves of all Northern Democrats. Three quarters of the Republican party were made up twenty-five years ago of Democrats that would no longer consent to be slaves.

Now, why am I going into that long tirade in the past? For this purpose. After the war was over, and reconstruction completed, this same Southern political hierarchy came back into power in Washington, and to-day they are as consolidated as the slaveholding politicians of 1860-'61 were! And to-day they hold in their grip absolutely all the Northern members of their party! The Northern doughface has again appeared in American politics, and he is found wherever a Democratic Congressman sits. I say, without offense, it is the literal truth that this day there is not in all this country a free and absolutely independent-minded Democratic member of either House of your Congress at Washington.

Now, let me go back for a moment, and return to this point with a reinforcement.

Are you aware that there is one thing that can kill this country, and kill it beyond all hope? That one thing is the destruction or enslavement of its voting population. The voting population of the United States is the only sovereign on this continent. You talk about the sovereign States, or even the sovereign Nation. A corporation is not a sovereign. The corporation that we call Ohio was made by the people, and they are its sovereigns. Even the grand corporation that we call the United States was created also by the people, who are its superiors, and its only sovereigns. Now, therefore, if anything happens in this country to corrupt, or enslave, or destroy the voters of the United States, that is an irreparable injury to liberty and the Union. If in Europe they slay a sovereign, one man is killed, and another can be found to take his place; but when they slay our sovereign, there is no heir to the throne; our sovereign has no successor.

Well, now, that is rather general, but I ask you to come down to particulars. Let me make this statement to you: in 1872, only seven years ago, in the eleven States that went into rebellion there were cast, at a free and fair election, 759,000 Republican votes and 650,000 Democratic votes. There is liberty for you! There are a million and a quarter of free voting citizens casting their ballots for the men of their choice!

This country has been growing in the last seven years, but let me tell you what calamity has happened to us. In those same eleven late Rebel States there have disappeared apparently from the face of the earth 400,000 American voters. Fellow citizens, that is an awful sentence which I have just spoken in your hearing. I repeat it. In eleven States of this Union there have disappeared apparently from the face of the earth 400,000 American voters. Where have they gone? They are all Republicans. Have they gone to the Democratic party? No; for the Democratic party has also lost some of its voters in those States. What has happened? I will tell you. That spirit of Southern tyranny, that old spirit of despotism born of slavery, has arisen and killed freedom in the South. It has slain liberty in at least seven of the eleven States of the South.

It happened in this wise: In 1872, in five States of the South, we had a marked, overwhelming, and fair majority of Republican votes. For example, in the State of Mississippi, at the Congressional election of 1872, there were thrown 80,803 Republican votes, and there were thrown 40,500 Democratic votes. That was a fair test of the strength of the two parties. Five Republicans and one Democrat were elected to Congress from the State of Mississippi. Six years passed, and in 1878 there were just 2,056 Republican votes thrown in the State of Mississippi. How many Democratic votes? Thirty-five thousand. They had fallen off 5,000; the Republicans had fallen off 78,000 votes. Where had the 78,000 voters gone? I will tell you. The rebel army, without uniforms, organized itself as Democratic clubs in Mississippi, and, armed with shot-guns and rifles, surrounded the houses of Republican voters, with the muzzles of their guns at their heads, in the night, and said, "You come out and vote, if you dare. We will kill you when you come." And all over the State of Mississippi the Democratic party, being the old rebel army, deployed itself among the cabins of the blacks and killed liberty everywhere throughout that State.

Why, in a district of Mississippi where, in 1872, fifteen thousand Republican votes were polled, and eight thousand Democratic, there were but four thousand polled for a rebel general, and twelve scattering votes polled for other people—not one Republican vote put in a box in all the district. So it was in Alabama. So it was in Louisiana, in part. So it was in the two Carolinas. The result was this: four hundred thousand voters substantially annihilated. And the further result was this: thirty Democratic rebels elected in Republican districts, where liberty had first been slain; and to-day there are thirty members of Congress, not one of whom has any more right to sit there and make laws for you and me than an inhabitant of that jail has a right to go there and make laws for us. They are not created Congressmen by virtue of law, but by virtue of murder, assassination, riot, intimidation; and on the dead body of American liberty they stand and make laws for you and me. That

gives them the House. That gives them the Senate. That gives the old slave power and the old rebel power its grip again on the country, and it gives them what we call the Solid South. I am talking plain talk. I am talking words that I expect will be read by every gentleman in Congress whom I am to-night denouncing. I expect to meet those gentlemen and make good every word I say.

Now, what purpose has this Solid South in thus grasping power and killing liberty? This: they are determined to make their old "lost cause" the triumphing cause. Who is their leader to-day? By all odds, the most popular man south of Mason and Dixon's line is Jefferson Davis of Mississippi. He is to-day their hero and their leader; and I will give you my proof of it.

Do you know that our friend General Rice has been making a great deal of small capital out of the fact that he introduced an Arrears of Pensions Bill for soldiers? You all know what kind of a bill that was. It was a bill granting arrears of pensions to our soldiers; but it also granted arrears of pensions to all rebel soldiers who had fought in the Mexican War. We made a law that the name of a man who had taken up arms against this country should be stricken from our pension rolls, and he should receive no money out of our treasury. That law Mr. Rice's bill repealed in so far as it related to the Mexican soldiers, and he knew and was told plainly that that clause included Jefferson Davis as one of the pensioners to be helped by that law; and even in that rebel Congress there were many Democrats that could not quite be brought up to the scratch to vote to pension Jefferson Davis; and hence Mr. Rice's bill hung in the committee and was not reported. Then a Republican member of the House moved to discharge the committee from the consideration of the whole subject. He introduced a bill that did not have Jefferson Davis in it, but had only our soldiers in it; and that bill, not Mr. Rice's, passed. But when that bill got to the Senate a Democrat moved to add the Rice section that covered all rebel pensioners under its provisions; and then it was that Mr. Hoar of Massachusetts called the attention of the United States Senate to the fact that that amendment would include Jefferson Davis,

and he moved an amendment to the amendment that it should not be so construed.

What followed? Immediately there sprang to his feet our Ohio Senator. I blush for my State when I repeat it. Allen G. Thurman arose to his feet and said, "The Democratic Legislature of Ohio has instructed me to vote to pension the soldiers of the Mexican War, and they did not instruct me to make an exception against Jefferson Davis, and therefore I vote against Mr. Hoar's amendment." Thereupon Mr. Hoar spoke against the amendment that would pension Jefferson Davis, and the moment he did it there sprang up all over that chamber champions and defenders of Jefferson Davis. The tomahawks literally flew, or rather metaphorically flew, everywhere at the head of any Republican that dared to suggest that the Government ought not to pension Jefferson Davis. Lamar of Mississippi, an eloquent and able Senator, arose in his place and said that there had not lived on this earth, from the days of Hampden to Washington, a purer patriot and a nobler man than Jefferson Davis of Mississippi. Man after man exhausted his eloquence in defending and eulogizing the arch-rebel, who led this country into oceans of blood. I give you that to show the spirit that animates the people that rule in Congress to-day.

Now let me say a word more that connects what I am saying with the old story of the days before slavery was dead. I have been seventeen years a member of the House, and in all that period I never have once known, as my friends here on the stand can testify in their experience, of the members of the Republican party binding themselves in a caucus to support any bill before Congress. I have seen it tried once or twice, but I have always seen dozens of Republicans spring to their feet, and say, "I am a free man, and I will vote according to the interests of my constituents and the dictates of my conscience, and no caucus shall bind me."

But the moment the Democratic party got back into power again, that moment they organized the caucus—the secret caucus, the oath-bound caucus; for within the recent extra session they have actually taken oaths not to divulge what occurred in caucus, and to be bound by whatever the

caucus decreed, and I have known man after man, who had sworn by all the wicked gods at once that he would not be bound to go for a certain measure, walk out of the caucus like a sheep led to the slaughter, and vote for the bill that he had cursed. They brought bills at the extra session so full of manifest errors that when we pointed them out they would admit in private that there were errors that ought to be corrected, but they would say, "I have agreed to vote for it without amendment, and I will." We pointed out wretchedly bad grammar in bills, and they would not even correct their grammar, because the caucus had adopted it. Now, therefore, gentlemen, the Congress of the United States is ruled by a caucus. It has ceased to be a deliberative body. It is ruled by a secret caucus, and who rules the caucus? Two thirds of its members are men who fought this country in war; who tried to destroy this nation; and who to-day look upon Jefferson Davis as the foremost patriot and highest political leader in America. Therefore, the leadership which rules you is the rebellion in Congress.

Well, now, what of that? This is not all. They look over the field of 1880, and they say they have got in their hands the Solid South, and they lack only one thing more. They lack thirty-seven electoral votes to add to their one hundred and thirty-five, and they have captured the offices of the Government and have captured the Presidency. The South will have the whole control of this republic in its hands.

Now, how are they going to get the thirty-seven electoral votes? There are two States that will fill the bill—New York and Ohio. If they can get those two States next year, they have indeed captured the Government. This good friend says they can't have them. They can not get them in this audience. This is not the place to capture the State of Ohio for rebel brigadiers. They can not capture it in any of the great agricultural counties of Ohio, for they are sound and true to the Union, and loyal to their heart's core. They can not go into the central parts of patriotic New York and capture the thirty-seven votes.

But I will tell you, fellow citizens, what they hope to do, and there is one way by

which they may succeed. Let me stop and say one single word to you about the great cities. Thomas Jefferson said that great cities were the sores on the body politic—the cancers whose roots run down and curse, and will ultimately break up, the country unless they are ruled. A city of the size of Cleveland has its troubles. A great city like the city of New York has passed the bounds of safety in this country.

The ablest orator that Rome ever produced, in describing the political party led by Catiline, said that all the bankrupts, all the desperadoes, all the thieves and robbers and murderers gathered around Catiline; and, finally, in a horrible figure of tremendous power, he said that the party of Catiline was "the bilge-water of Rome." What a figure that is, my friends! What do you mean by "bilge-water"? That water that leaks stealthily through your planks and down below the deck; and in the darkness, out of sight, out of reach, it reeks and stagnates and stinks, breeds pestilence, and brings death upon all that are on board. Cicero said that that party that gathered in Rome was "the bilge-water of Rome," and into that bilge-water, in the cities of Cincinnati and New York, the Democratic party desire to insert their political pumps and pump out the hell-broth that can poison and corrupt and ruin the freedom of both these great cities, and gain them to the Solid South. That is the programme. If they can get control of the elections, they will make both those cities strongly enough Democratic to overwhelm all the votes that the green lanes of our country can grow.

Now, what is in the way of that? Just two things. The United States has passed a law to put a Democrat at one end of the ballot-box in the great cities and a Republican at the other end, and it empowered those two men, not to run the election, but to stand there as eyes of the Government and look—look first to see that the ballot-box is empty when they begin, and then to stand and look into the faces of every man that votes, and, if he comes to vote twice, record it and have him brought before the judge and sent to the penitentiary for his crime, and to stay there until the polls are closed, and then not allow the ballot-boxes

to be sent off and the vote counted in secret by partisan judges, but to be opened and unfolded and read in the light of day, recorded and certified to by the Republican and Democratic officers, so that the justice of the ballot-box should not be outraged and freedom should not be slain.

No juster law was ever passed on this continent than that. It saved New York from the supremest of crimes. It elicited, even from a Democratic committee of which A. V. Rice was a member, the highest possible encomium in 1876. And he and Sunset Cox, of New York, in their official report to Congress, recommended to all parts of the country the admirable election law of Congress that brought into unison and coöperation the officers of the State and the officers of the nation, in keeping a pure ballot and a free election in the great cities. That is what the Democratic party said of this law in 1876. But their masters of the caucus had not then given out their decree. They have now given it, and the decree from the secret caucus, the decree from their old slave-masters, has now gone forth: "Take those two men away from the ballot-box. Wipe out the election law, so that the Tweeds of New York and the Eph Hollands of Cincinnati may have free course, and do the work and fix 1880 in their own way." That is the programme of the rebel brigadiers in Congress.

I understand that Mr. Ewing said here the other night he was amazed to hear Republicans talk as though they were afraid of a few rebel brigadiers. It was not so surprising, he said, that our friend Foster should be afraid of them, throwing a slur at him because he was not in the army. but he was surprised that General Garfield should be alarmed at the brigadiers. I am here to answer General Ewing. As to who is afraid of brigadiers, let him boast who has the first need to boast.

But there are some things I am afraid of, and I confess it in this great presence. I am afraid to do a mean thing. I am afraid of any policy that will let the vileness of New York City pour its foul slime over the freedom of the American ballot-box and ruin it. And the man that is not afraid of that, I am ashamed of him.

Now, how to get those two men away from the ballot-box is the rebel problem. If they get them away, the Solid South has triumphed. If they get them away, "the lost cause" has won, and Jefferson Davis is crowned as the foremost man in America. If they get them away, good-by for a generation to come to the old "Pilgrim Covenant" and the doctrine of the right of the majority to rule.

Now, how did they undertake to get them away? In this way: They said to us, "At last we have got you. We have the control of the Treasury. No money can be employed to support the Government unless we vote it by an appropriation. Now, we tell you that we will never vote one dollar to support your Government until you join us in tearing down that election law and taking away those two witnesses from the polls." That is what they told us.

Then we answered them thus: "Eighteen years ago you were in power in this Congress, and the last act of your domination was this: you told us that, if we dared to elect Abraham Lincoln President, you would shoot our Government to death; and we answered, 'We are free men, begotten of freedom, and are accustomed to vote our thoughts. We believe in Abraham Lincoln. We will elect him President.' And we did. And then eleven great States declared that they would shoot the Union to death, and we appealed to the majesty of the great North land, and went out into a thousand bloody battle-fields, and we shot the shooters to death and saved this Union alive. And for eighteen years you have been in exile, banished from power, and now, by virtue of murder, and assassination, and the slaying of liberty, you have come back; and the first act you do on your return is not now courageously to dare us out to battle, but, like assassins, cowards, murderers, you come to us and say, 'With our hand on the throat of your Government, we will starve it to death if you do not let us pluck down the sacred laws that protect the purity of elections.'" And we said to them: "By the sacred memories of eighteen years ago, we reply, 'You shall not starve this Government to death, nor shall you tear down these laws. The men that saved it in battle will

now feed it in peace. The men that bore it on their shields in the hour of death will feed it with the gift of their hands in the hour of its glory.'" And they said, "You shall try it." And they passed their iniquitous bill. They took the bread of the Government and spread upon it the poison of the bilge-water of New York and Cincinnati, and they said to the Government, "Eat this or starve." They passed the iniquity through the House and through the Senate, and it went to an Ohio Republican who sits in the seat of great Washington, whose arm is mailed with the thunderbolt of the Constitution; and he hurled the power of his veto against the wicked bill, and killed it. Five times they tried the iniquity, and five times he killed with the power of the Constitution the wickedness they sought to perpetrate. And then, like sneaking cowards as they were, they passed the appropriations all but six hundred thousand dollars, and said, "We will come back to it next winter, and we will never give it up until we conquer you; and in the mean time," they said, "we will appeal to the people at the ballot-box." They are now making that appeal. And so are we. That is what we are here for to-night. And it is that appeal that awakens this people as it has never been awakened before since the days of Vallandigham and Brough, especially Brough. In the presence of this people, in the heart of this old Reserve, I feel the consciousness of our strength and the assurance of our victory.

Now, fellow citizens, a word before I leave you, on the very eve of the holy day of God—a fit moment to consecrate ourselves finally to the great work of next Tuesday morning. I see in this great audience to-night a great many young men, young men who are about to cast their first vote. I want to give you a word of suggestion and advice. I heard a very brilliant thing said by a boy the other day up in one of our northwestern counties. He said to me, "General, I have a great mind to vote the Democratic ticket." That was not the brilliant thing. I said to him, "Why?" "Why," said he, "my father is a Republican, and my brothers are Republicans, and I am a Republican all over; but I want to be an independent man, and I don't want any-

body to say, 'That fellow votes the Republican ticket just because his dad does,' and I have half a mind to vote the Democratic ticket just to prove my independence." I did not like the thing the boy suggested, but I did admire the spirit of the boy that wanted to have some independence of his own.

Now, I tell you, young man, don't vote the Republican ticket just because your father votes it. Don't vote the Democratic ticket, even if he does vote it. But let me give you this one word of advice, as you are about to pitch your tent in one of the great political camps. Your life is full and buoyant with hope now, and I beg you, when you pitch your tent, pitch it among the living and not among the dead. If you are at all inclined to pitch it among the Democratic people and with that party, let me go with you for a moment while we survey the ground where I hope you will not shortly lie. It is a sad place, young man, for you to put your young life into. It is to me far more like a graveyard than like a camp for the living. Look at it! It is billowed all over with the graves of dead issues, of buried opinions, of exploded theories, of disgraced doctrines. You can not live in comfort in such a place. Why, look here! Here is a little double mound. I look down on it and I read, "Sacred to the memory of squatter sovereignty and the Dred Scott decision." A million and a half of Democrats voted for that, but it has been dead fifteen years—died by the hand of Abraham Lincoln, and here it lies. Young man, that is not the place for you.

But look a little further. Here is another monument, a black tomb, and beside it, as our distinguished friend said, there towers to the sky a monument of four million pairs of human fetters taken from the arms of slaves, and I read on its little headstone this: "Sacred to the memory of human slavery." For forty years of its infamous life the Democratic party taught that it was divine—God's institution. They defended it, they stood around it, they followed it to its grave as mourners. But here it lies, dead by the hand of Abraham Lincoln, dead by the power of the Republican party, dead by the justice of Almighty God. Don't camp there, young man.

But here is another, a little brimstone tomb, and I read across its yellow face in lurid, bloody lines these words: "Sacred to the memory of State sovereignty and secession." Twelve millions of Democrats mustered around it in arms to keep it alive; but here it lies, shot to death by the million guns of the Republic. Here it lies, its shrine burned to ashes under the blazing rafters of the burning Confederacy. It is dead! I would not have you stay in there a minute, even in this balmy night air, to look at such a place.

But just before I leave it I discover a new-made grave, a little mound—short. The grass has hardly sprouted over it, and all around it I see torn pieces of paper with the word "flat" on them; and I look down in curiosity, wondering what the little grave is, and I read on it: "Sacred to the memory of the Rag Baby; nursed in the brain of all the fanaticism of the world; rocked by Thomas Ewing, George H. Pendleton, Samuel Cary, and a few others throughout the land. But it died on the 1st of January, 1879, and the one hundred and forty millions of gold that God made, and not fiat power, lie upon its little carcass to keep it down for ever."

Oh, young man, come out of that! That is no place in which to put your young life. Come out, and come over into this camp of liberty, of order, of law, of justice, of freedom, of all that is glorious under these night stars.

Is there any death here in our camp? Yes! yes! Three hundred and fifty thousand soldiers, the noblest band that ever trod the earth, died to make this camp a camp of glory and of liberty for ever.

But there are no dead issues here. There are no dead ideas here. Hang out our banner from under the blue sky this night until it shall sweep the green turf under your feet! It hangs over our camp. Read away up under the stars the inscription we have written on it, lo! these twenty-five years.

Twenty-five years ago the Republican party was married to liberty, and this is our silver wedding, fellow citizens. A worthily married pair love each other better on the day of their silver wedding than on the day of their first espousals; and we are truer to

liberty to-day and dearer to God than we were when we spoke our first word of liberty. Read away up under the sky across our starry banner that first word we uttered twenty-five years ago! What was it? "Slavery shall never extend over another foot of the territories of the Great West." Is that dead or alive? Alive, thank God, for evermore! And truer to-night than it was the hour it was written! Then it was a hope, a promise, a purpose. To-night it is equal with the stars—immortal history and immortal truth.

Come down the glorious steps of our banner. Every great record we have made, we have vindicated with our blood and with our truth. It sweeps the ground, and it touches the stars. Come there, young man, and put in your young life where all is living, and where nothing is dead but the heroes that defended it. I think these young men will do that.

Gentlemen, we are closing this memorable campaign. We have got our enemies on the run everywhere. And all you need to do in this noble old city, this capital of the Western Reserve, is to follow them up and finish it by snowing the rebellion up once more. We stand on an isthmus. This year and next is the narrow isthmus between us and perpetual victory. If you can win now and win in 1880, then the very stars in their courses will fight for us. The census will do the work, and will give us thirty more free men of the North in our Congress that will make up for the rebellion of the South. We are posted here as the Greeks were posted at Thermopylæ to meet this one great barbarian Xerxes of the Isthmus. Stand in your places, men of Ohio! Fight this battle, win this victory, and then one more puts you in safety for ever!

I thank you, fellow citizens, for your patience.

XI.

COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTE.

In the House of Representatives, January 25, 1877.

"A people who can understand and act upon the counsels which God has given it in the past events of its history, is safe in the most dangerous crisis of its fate."—*Guizot*.

WHAT, then, are the grounds on which we should consider a bill like this? It would be unbecoming in me or in any member of this Congress to oppose this bill on mere technical or trifling grounds. It should be opposed, if at all, for reasons so broad, so weighty as to overcome all that has been said in its favor, and all the advantages which I have here admitted may follow from its passage. I do not wish to diminish the stature of my antagonist; I do not wish to undervalue the points of strength in a measure before I question its propriety. It is not enough that this bill will tide us over a present danger, however great. Let us for a moment forget Hayes and Tilden, Republicans and Democrats; let us forget our own epoch and our own generation; and, entering a broader field, inquire how this thing which we are about to do will affect the great future of our republic, and in what condition, if we pass this bill, we shall transmit our institutions to those who shall come after us. The present good which we shall achieve by it may be very great; yet if the evils that will flow from it in the future must be greater, it would be base in us to flinch from trouble by entailing remediless evils upon our children.

In my view, then, the foremost question is this: What will be the effect of this measure upon our institutions? I can not make that inquiry intelligibly without a brief reference to the history of the Constitution, and to some of the formidable questions which presented themselves to our fathers nearly a hundred years ago, when they set up this goodly frame of government.

Among the foremost difficulties, both in point of time and magnitude, was how to create an executive head of the nation. Our fathers encountered that difficulty the first morning after they organized and elected the officers of the Constitutional Convention. The first resolution introduced by Randolph

of Virginia, on the 29th day of May, recognized that great question, and invited the Convention to its examination. The men who made the Constitution were deeply read in the profoundest political philosophy of their day. They had learned from Montesquieu, from Locke, from Fénelon, and other great teachers of the human race, that liberty is impossible without a clear and distinct separation of the three great powers of government. A generation before their epoch, Montesquieu had said :

When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person or in the same body of magistrates, there can be no liberty, because apprehensions may arise lest the same monarch or senate should enact tyrannical laws to execute them in a tyrannical manner.

There would be an end of everything were the same man or the same body, whether of the nobles or of the people, to exercise these three powers, that of enacting the laws, that of executing the public resolutions, and of trying the causes of individuals.

This was a fundamental truth in the American mind, as it had long been cherished and practiced in the British empire.

There, as in all monarchies, the creation of a chief executive was easily regulated by adopting a dynasty, and following the law of primogeniture.

But our fathers had drawn the deeper lesson of liberty from the inspirations of this free New World, that their Chief Executive should be born, not of a dynasty, but of the will of a free people regulated by law.

In the course of their deliberations upon this subject, there were suggested seven different plans, which may be grouped under two principal heads or classes. One group comprised all the plans for creating the Chief Executive by means of some one of the preëxisting political organizations of the country. First and foremost was the proposition to authorize one or both Houses of the National Legislature to elect the Chief Executive. Another was to confer that power upon the governors of the States, or upon the legislatures of the States. Another, that he should be chosen directly by the people themselves under the laws of the States. The second group comprised all the various

plans for creating a new and separate instrumentality for making the choice.

At first the proposition that the Executive should be elected by the National Legislature was received by the Convention with almost unanimous approval; and for the reason that up to that time Congress had done all that was done in the way of national government. It had created the nation, and led its fortunes through a thousand perils, had declared and achieved independence, and had preserved the liberty of the people in the midst of a great war. Though Congress had failed to secure a firm and stable Government after the war, yet its glory was not forgotten. As Congress had created the Union, it was most natural that our fathers should say Congress should also create the Chief Executive of the nation. And within two weeks after the Convention assembled they voted for that plan with absolute unanimity.

But with equal unanimity they agreed that this plan would be fatal to the stability of the Government they were about to establish, if they did not couple with it some provision that should make the President's functions independent of the power that created him. To effect this, they provided that the President should be ineligible for reelection. They said it would never do to create a Chief Executive by the voice of the National Legislature, and then allow him to be reëlected by that same voice; for he would thus become their creature.

And so, from the first day of their session in May to within five days of its close in September, they grappled with the mighty question. I have many times, and recently very carefully, gone through all the records that are left to us of that great transaction. I find that more than one seventh of all the pages of the Madison papers are devoted to this Samson of questions, how the Executive should be chosen and made independent of the organization that made the choice. This topic alone occupied more than one seventh of all the time of the Convention.

After a long and earnest debate, after numerous votes and reconsiderations, they were obliged utterly to abandon the plan of creating the Chief Executive by means of the National Legislature. I will not stop

now to prove the statement by a dozen or more pungent quotations from the masters of political science in that great assembly, in which they declared that it would be ruinous to the liberty of the people and to the permanence of the republic if they did not absolutely exclude the National Legislature from any share in the election of the President.

They pointed with glowing eloquence to the sad but instructive fate of those brilliant Italian republics that were destroyed because there was no adequate separation of powers, and because their senates overwhelmed and swallowed up the executive power, and, as secret and despotic conclaves, became the destroyers of Italian liberty.

At the close of the great discussion, when the last vote on this subject was taken by our fathers, they were almost unanimous in excluding the National Legislature from any share whatever in the choice of the Chief Executive of the nation. They rejected all the plans of the first group, and created a new instrumentality. They adopted the system of electors. When that plan was under discussion they used the utmost precaution to hedge it about by every conceivable protection against the interference or control of Congress.

In the first place, they said the States shall create the electoral colleges. They allowed Congress to have nothing whatever to do with the creation of the colleges, except merely to fix the time when the States should appoint them. And, in order to exclude Congress by positive prohibition, in the last days of the Convention they provided that no member of either House of Congress should be appointed an elector; so that not even by the personal influence of any one of its members could the Congress interfere with the election of a President.

The creation of a President under our Constitution consists of three distinct steps: First, the creation of the electoral colleges; second, the vote of colleges; and, third, the opening and counting of their votes. This is the simple plan of the Constitution.

The creation of the colleges is left absolutely to the States, within the five limitations I had the honor to mention to the House a few days ago. First, it must be a

State that appoints electors; second, the State is limited as to the number of electors they may appoint; third, electors shall not be members of Congress, nor officers of the United States; fourth, the time for appointing electors may be fixed by Congress; and, fifth, the time when their appointment is announced, which must be before the date for giving their votes, may also be fixed by Congress.

These five simple limitations, and these alone, were laid upon the States. Every other act, fact, and thing possible to be done in creating the electoral colleges was absolutely and uncontrollably in the power of the States themselves. Within these limitations, Congress has no more power to touch them in this work than England or France. That is the first step.

The second is still plainer and simpler, namely, the work of the colleges. They were created as an independent and separate power, or set of powers, for the sole purpose of electing a President. They were created by the States. Congress has just one thing to do with them, and only one: it may fix the day when they shall meet. By the act of 1792 Congress fixed the day as it still stands in the law; and there the authority of the Congress over the colleges ended.

There was a later act—of 1845—which gave to the States the authority to provide by law for filling vacancies of electors in these colleges; and Congress has passed no other law on the subject.

The States having created them, the time of their assemblage having been fixed by Congress, and their power to fill vacancies having been regulated by State laws, the colleges are as independent in the exercise of their functions as is any department of the Government within its sphere. Being thus equipped, their powers are restrained by a few simple limitations laid upon them by the Constitution itself: first, they must vote for a native-born citizen; second, for a man who has been fourteen years a resident of the United States; third, at least one of the persons for whom they vote must not be a citizen of their own State; fourth, the mode of voting and certifying their returns is prescribed by the Constitution itself. Within these simple and plain limitations

the electoral colleges are absolutely independent of the States and of Congress.

One fact in the history of the Constitutional Convention, which I have not seen noticed in any of the recent debates, illustrates very clearly how careful our fathers were to preserve these colleges from the interference of Congress, and to protect their independence by the bulwarks of the Constitution itself. In the draught of the electoral system reported September 4, 1787, it was provided that Congress "may determine the time of choosing and assembling of the electors *and the manner of certifying and transmitting their votes.*"

That was the language of the original draught; but our fathers had determined that the National Legislature should have nothing to do with the action of the colleges; and the words that gave Congress the power to prescribe the manner of certifying and transmitting their votes were stricken out. The instrument itself prescribed the mode. Thus Congress was wholly expelled from the colleges. The Constitution swept the ground clear of all intruders, and placed its own imperial guardianship around the independence of the electoral colleges by forbidding even Congress to enter the sacred circle. No Congressman could enter; and, except to fix the day of their meeting, Congress could not speak to the electors.

These colleges are none the less sovereign and independent because they exist only for a day. They meet on the same day in all the States; they do their work summarily in one day, and dissolve for ever. There is no power to interfere, no power to recall them, no power to revise their action. Their work is done; the record is made up, signed, sealed, and transmitted; and thus the second great act in the Presidential election is completed. I ought to correct myself: the second act *is* the Presidential election. The election is finished the hour when the electoral colleges have cast their votes and sealed up the record.

Still, there is a third step in the process; and it is shorter, plainer, simpler than the other two. These sealed certificates of the electoral colleges are forwarded to the President of the Senate, where they rest under the silence of the seals for more than two

months. The Constitution assumes that the result of the election is still unknown. But on a day fixed by law, and the only day of all the days of February on which the law commands Congress to be in session, the last act in the plan of electing a President is to be performed.

How plain and simple are the words that describe this third and last step! Here they are:

The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted.

Here is no ambiguity. Two words dominate and inspire the clause. They are the words *open* and *count*. These words are not shrouded in the black-letter mysteries of the law. They are plain words, understood by every man who speaks our mother-tongue, and need no lexicon or commentary.

Consider the grand and simple ceremonial by which the third act is to be completed. On the day fixed by law, the two Houses of Congress are assembled. The President of the Senate, who, by the Constitution, has been made the custodian of the sealed certificates from all the electoral colleges, takes his place. The Constitution requires a "person" and a "presence." That "person" is the President of the Senate; and that "presence" is the "presence" of the two Houses. Then two things are to be *done*. The certificates are to be opened, and the votes are to be counted. These are not legislative acts, but clearly and plainly executive acts. I challenge any man to find anywhere an accepted definition of an executive act that does not include both these. They can not be tortured into a meaning that will carry them beyond the boundaries of executive action. And one of these acts the President of the Senate is peremptorily ordered to perform. The Constitution commands him to "open all the certificates." Certificates of what? Certificates of the votes of the electoral colleges. Not any certificates that anybody may choose to send, but certificates of electors appointed by the States. The President of the Senate is presumed to know what are the States in the Union, who are their officers, and, when

he opens the certificates, he learns from the official record who have been appointed electors, and he finds their votes.

The Constitution contemplated the President of the Senate as the Vice-President of the United States, the elect of all the people. And to him is confided the great trust, the custodianship of the only official record of the election of President. What is it to "open the certificates"? It would be a narrow and inadequate view of that word to say that it means only the breaking of the seals. To open an envelope is not to "open the certificates." The certificate is not the paper on which the record is made; it is the record itself. To open the certificate is not a physical but an intellectual act. It is to make patent the record; to publish it. When that is done the election of President and Vice-President is published. But one thing remains to be done; and here the language of the Constitution changes from the active to the passive voice, from the personal to the impersonal. To the trusted custodian of the votes succeeds the impersonality of arithmetic; the votes have been made known; there remains only the command of the Constitution, "they shall be counted," that is, the numbers shall be added up.

No further act is required. The Constitution itself declares the result:

The person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed.

If no person has such majority, the House of Representatives shall *immediately* choose a President; not the House as organized for legislation, but a new electoral college is created out of the members of the House, by means of which each State has one vote for President, and only one.

To review the ground over which I have traveled: The several acts that constitute the election of a President may be symbolized by a pyramid consisting of three massive, separate blocks. The first, the creation of the electoral college by the States, is the broad base. It embraces the legislative, the judicial, and the executive powers of the States. All the departments of the State Government and all the voters of the State cooperate in shaping and perfecting it.

The action of the electoral colleges forms the second block, perfect in itself, and independent of the others, superimposed with exactness upon the first.

The opening and counting of the votes of the colleges is the little block that crowns and completes the pyramid.

Such, Mr. Speaker, was the grand and simple plan by which the framers of the Constitution empowered all the people, acting under the laws of the several States, to create special and select colleges of independent electors to choose a President, who should be, not the creature of Congress, nor of the States, but the Chief Magistrate of the whole nation, the elect of all the people.

When the Constitution was completed and sent to the people of the States for ratification, it was subjected to the severest criticism of the ablest men of that generation. Those sections which related to the election of President not only escaped censure, but received the highest commendation. The sixty-seventh number of "The Federalist," written by Alexander Hamilton, was devoted to this feature of the instrument. That great writer congratulated the country that the Convention had devised a method that made the President free from all preexisting bodies, that protected the process of election from all interference by Congress and from the cabals and intrigues so likely to arise in legislative bodies.

The mode of appointment of the Chief Magistrate of the United States is almost the only part of the system of any consequence which has escaped without severe censure, or which has received the slightest mark of approbation from its opponents. The most plausible of these who has appeared in print has even deigned to admit that the election of the President is pretty well guarded. I venture somewhat further, and hesitate not to affirm that, if the manner of it be not perfect, it is at least excellent. It unites in an eminent degree all the advantages the union of which was to be wished for. It was desirable that the sense of the people should operate in the choice of the person to whom so important a trust was to be confided. This end will be answered by committing the right of making it not to any pre-established body, but to men chosen by the people for the special purpose and at the particular juncture. . . . They have not made the appointment of the President to depend on any preexist-

ing bodies of men, who might be tampered with beforehand to prostitute their votes; but they have referred it in the first instance to an immediate act of the people of America, to be exerted in the choice of persons for the temporary and sole purpose of making the appointment. And they have excluded from eligibility to this trust all those who from situation might be suspected of too great devotion to the President in office. . . .

Another and no less important desideratum was that the Executive should be independent for his continuance in office on all but the people themselves. He might otherwise be tempted to sacrifice his duty to his complaisance for those whose favor was necessary to duration of his official consequence. This advantage will also be secured by making his reelection to depend on a special body of representatives, deputed by the society for the single purpose of making the important choice—*From the Sixty-seventh Number of "The Federalist."*

The earliest commentator upon the Constitution, St. George Tucker of Virginia, writing at the beginning of the present century, made this clause of the Constitution the subject of special eulogy, and pointed to the fact that all the proceedings in relation to the election of a President were to be brief, summary, and decisive; that the right of the President to his office depends upon no one but the people themselves, and that the certificates of his election were to be publicly opened "and counted in the presence of the whole National Legislature."

The electors, we perceive, are to assemble on one and the same day, in all the different States, at as many different places, at a very considerable distance from each other, and on that day are simply to give their votes; they then disperse and return to their respective habitations and occupations immediately. No pretext can be had for delay; no opportunity is furnished for intrigue and cabal. The certificates of their votes . . . are to be publicly opened and counted in the presence of the whole National Legislature. . . . There is no room for the turbulence of a *Campus Martius* or a *Polish Diet*, on the one hand, nor for the intrigues of the Sacred College or a Venetian Senate on the other; unless when it unfortunately happens that two persons, having a majority of the whole number of electors in their favor, have likewise an equal number of votes, or where by any other means the election may devolve upon the House of Representatives.

Then, indeed, intrigue and cabal may have their full scope; then may the existence of the Union be put in extreme hazard.—*Tucker's "Blackstone," Appendix, pp. 326-327.*

The authorities I have quoted show that, great as was the satisfaction of the people with the mode of choosing a President, there was still an apprehension that trouble would arise from Congress by the only avenue left open for its influence, namely, the contingency in which the House might elect. Every other door was shut and barred against the interference of Congress or any member of Congress.

XII.

MARTIAL LAW.

From the speech in the Milligan and Bowles case, March 6, 1866:

From this review of the history and character of martial law, I am warranted by the uniform precedents of English law for many centuries, by the uniform practice of our fathers during the Colonial and Revolutionary periods, by the unanimous decisions of our courts, and by the teachings of our statesmen to conclude:

1. That the Executive has no authority to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus*, or to declare or administer martial law; much less has any military subordinate of the Executive such authority; but these high functions belong exclusively to the supreme legislative authority of the nation.

2. That if, in the presence of great and sudden danger, and under the pressure of overwhelming necessity, the Chief Executive should, without legislative warrant, suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* or declare martial law, he must not look to the courts for justification, but to the Legislature for indemnification.

3. That no such necessity can be pleaded to justify the trial of a civilian by a military tribunal when the legally authorized civil courts are open and unobstructed.

XIII.

GENERAL GARFIELD'S ACCEPTANCE.

MENTOR, OHIO, *July 10, 1880.*

DEAR SIR. On the evening of the 8th of June last I had the honor to receive from you, in the presence of the committee of which you were chairman, the official announcement that the Republican National Convention at Chicago had that day nominated me as their candidate for President of the United States. I accept the nomination with gratitude for the confidence it implies, and with a deep sense of the responsibilities it imposes. I cordially endorse the principles set forth in the platform adopted by the Convention. On nearly all the subjects of which it treats my opinions are on record among the published proceedings of Congress. I venture, however, to make special mention of some of the principal topics which are likely to become subjects of discussion.

Without reviewing the controversies which have been settled during the last twenty years, and with no purpose or wish to revive the passions of the late war, it should be said that while Republicans fully recognize and will strenuously defend all the rights retained by the people, and all the rights reserved to the States, they reject the pernicious doctrine of State supremacy which so long crippled the functions of the National Government, and at one time brought the Union very near to destruction. They insist that the United States is a nation, with ample power of self-preservation; that its Constitution, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are the supreme law of the land; that the right of the nation to determine the method by which its own Legislature shall be created can not be surrendered without abdicating one of the fundamental powers of Government; that the national laws relating to the election of representatives in Congress shall neither be violated nor evaded; that every elector shall be permitted freely and without intimidation to cast his lawful ballot at such election and have it honestly counted, and that

the potency of his vote shall not be destroyed by the fraudulent vote of any other person.

The best thoughts and energies of our people should be directed to those great questions of national well-being in which all have a common interest. Such efforts will soonest restore perfect peace to those who were lately in arms against each other, for justice and good-will will outlast passion. But it is certain that the wounds of the war can not be completely healed, and the spirit of brotherhood can not fully pervade the whole country, until every citizen, rich or poor, white or black, is secure in the free and equal enjoyment of every civil and political right guaranteed by the Constitution and the laws. Wherever the enjoyment of these rights is not assured, discontent will prevail, immigration will cease, and the social and industrial forces will continue to be disturbed by the migration of laborers and the consequent diminution of prosperity. The National Government should exercise all its constitutional authority to put an end to these evils; for all the people and all the States are members of one body, and no member can suffer without injury to all. The most serious evils which now afflict the South arise from the fact that there is not such freedom and toleration of political opinion and action that the minority party can exercise an effective and wholesome restraint upon the party in power. Without such restraint party rule becomes tyrannical and corrupt. The prosperity which is made possible in the South by its great advantage of soil and climate will never be realized until every voter can freely and safely support any party he pleases.

Next in importance to freedom and justice is popular education, without which neither freedom nor justice can be permanently maintained. Its interests are intrusted to the States and to the voluntary action of the people. Whatever help the nation can justly afford should be generously given to aid the States in supporting common schools; but it would be unjust to our people and dangerous to our institutions to apply any portion of the revenues of the nation, or of the States, to the support of sectarian schools. The separation of the

Church and the State in everything relating to taxation should be absolute.

On the subject of national finances, my views have been so frequently and fully expressed that little is needed in the way of additional statement. The public debt is now so well secured, and the rate of annual interest has been so reduced by refunding, that rigid economy in expenditures, and the faithful application of our surplus revenues to the payment of the principal of the debt, will gradually but certainly free the people from its burdens, and close with honor the financial chapter of the war. At the same time the Government can provide for all its ordinary expenditures, and discharge its sacred obligations to the soldiers of the Union, and to the widows and orphans of those who fell in its defense. The resumption of specie payments, which the Republican party so courageously and successfully accomplished, has removed from the field of controversy many questions that long and seriously disturbed the credit of the Government and the business of the country. Our paper currency is now as national as the flag, and resumption has not only made it everywhere equal to coin, but has brought into use our store of gold and silver. The circulating medium is more abundant than ever before, and we need only to maintain the equality of all our dollars to insure to labor and capital a measure of value from the use of which no one can suffer loss. The great prosperity which the country is now enjoying should not be endangered by any violent changes or doubtful financial experiments.

In reference to our custom laws a policy should be pursued which will bring revenues to the treasury, and will enable the labor and capital employed in our great industries to compete fairly in our own markets with the labor and capital of foreign producers. We legislate for the people of the United States, and not for the whole world; and it is our glory that the American laborer is more intelligent and better paid than his foreign competitor. Our country can not be independent unless its people, with their abundant natural resources, possess the requisite skill at any time to clothe, arm, and equip themselves for war, and in time of

peace to produce all the necessary implements of labor. It was the manifest intention of the founders of the Government to provide for the common defense, not by standing armies alone, but by raising among the people a greater army of artisans, whose intelligence and skill should powerfully contribute to the safety and glory of the nation.

Fortunately for the interest of commerce, there is no longer any formidable opposition to appropriations for the improvement of our harbors and great navigable rivers, provided that the expenditures for that purpose are strictly limited to works of national importance. The Mississippi River, with its great tributaries, is of such vital importance to so many millions of people that the safety of its navigation requires exceptional consideration. In order to secure to the nation the control of all its waters, President Jefferson negotiated the purchase of a vast territory, extending from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean. The wisdom of Congress should be invoked to devise some plan by which that great river shall cease to be a terror to those who dwell upon its banks, and by which its shipping may safely carry the industrial products of twenty-five millions of people. The interests of agriculture, which is the basis of all our material prosperity, and in which seven twelfths of our population are engaged, as well as the interests of manufactures and commerce, demand that the facilities for cheap transportation shall be increased by the use of all our great water-courses.

The material interests of this country, the traditions of its settlement, and the sentiment of our people, have led the Government to offer the widest hospitality to emigrants who seek our shores for new and happier homes, willing to share the burdens as well as the benefits of our society, and intending that their posterity shall become an undistinguishable part of our population. The recent movement of the Chinese to our Pacific Coast partakes but little of the qualities of such an immigration, either in its purposes or its result. It is too much like an importation to be welcomed without restriction; too much like an invasion to be looked upon without solicitude. We can not consent to allow any form of servile

labor to be introduced among us under the guise of immigration. Recognizing the gravity of this subject, the present Administration, supported by Congress, has sent to China a commission of distinguished citizens for the purpose of securing such a modification of the existing treaty as will prevent the evils likely to arise from the present situation. It is confidently believed that these diplomatic negotiations will be successful without the loss of commercial intercourse between the two powers, which promises a great increase of reciprocal trade and the enlargement of our markets. Should these efforts fail, it will be the duty of Congress to mitigate the evils already felt, and prevent their increase, by such restrictions as, without violence or injustice, will place upon a sure foundation the peace of our communities and the freedom and dignity of labor.

The appointment of citizens to the various executive and judicial offices of the Government is, perhaps, the most difficult of all duties which the Constitution has imposed on the Executive. The Convention wisely demands that Congress shall cooperate with the Executive Departments in placing the civil service on a better basis. Experience has proved that with our frequent changes of administration no system of reform can be made effective and permanent without the aid of legislation. Appointments to the military and naval service are so regulated by law and custom as to leave but little ground for complaint. It may not be wise to make similar regulations by law for the civil service. But, without invading the authority or necessary discretion of the Executive, Congress should devise a method that will

determine the tenure of office, and greatly reduce the uncertainty which makes that service so unsatisfactory. Without depriving any officer of his rights as a citizen, the Government should require him to discharge all his official duties with intelligence, efficiency, and faithfulness. To select wisely from our vast population those who are best fitted for the many offices to be filled requires an acquaintance far beyond the range of any one man. The Executive should, therefore, seek and receive the information and assistance of those whose knowledge of the communities in which the duties are to be performed best qualifies them to aid in making the wisest choice.

The doctrines announced by the Chicago Convention are not the temporary devices of a party to attract votes and carry an election. They are deliberate convictions resulting from a careful study of the spirit of our institutions, the events of our history, and the best impulses of our people. In my judgment, these principles should control the legislation and administration of the Government. In any event, they will guide my conduct until experience points out a better way.

If elected, it will be my purpose to enforce strict obedience to the Constitution and the laws, and to promote, as best I may, the interest and honor of the whole country, relying for support upon the wisdom of Congress, the intelligence and patriotism of the people, and the favor of God.

With great respect, I am very truly yours,

J. A. GARFIELD.

To the Hon. GEORGE F. HOAR, President of the Republican National Convention.

PART IV.

PUBLIC MEN AND SECULAR JOURNALS ON GENERAL GARFIELD.

EULOGY OF GENERAL GARFIELD BY SENATOR HOAR.

SENATOR HOAR, on his return to Worcester, Mass., was made the recipient of an ovation by his friends and fellow citizens. In the course of his speech, referring to the work of the Chicago Convention, he paid the following eloquent tribute to the character of its nominee for the Presidency:

But, my friends, with my full concurrence, with your full concurrence, the Convention at Chicago came to another conclusion. And I not only say with my full concurrence, but I am willing to say to you that one of the five or six supreme moments of my life, when the delights of great periods of time seem to be crowded and concentrated into a single moment. was that instant when I saw coming out of that confusion and turmoil and storm of passion and conflict the result, as the ballot gradually was announced, to which the Convention finally came, the nomination of General Garfield. Accepted as it is in the beginning by all classes and shades of Republicans and of patriots, it will grow in public favor as the canvass goes on. Just think for a moment of the various qualifications for this great office which this man combines! Do you want a statesman? Do you demand that your President shall be something more than a successful soldier—that he shall have experience in civil affairs? No President of

the United States since John Quincy Adams began to bring to the Presidential office, when he entered upon it, anything like the experience in statesmanship of James A. Garfield. Look out over the list. Grant and Jackson and Taylor brought great fame as soldiers; but of whom can you think since John Quincy Adams entered upon that great office who had, when he took it, such a civil career to look back upon as that of General Garfield? Since the year 1864 you can not think of a question which has been debated in Congress, or discussed before the great tribunal of the American people, in regard to which you will not find, if you wish instruction, the argument on one side stated, and stated in almost every instance better than by anybody else, in some speech made in the House of Representatives or on the hustings by Mr. Garfield. Do you demand a man of firm, resolute, consistent adherence to what he thinks right, in spite of popular delusion, popular passion, fear of the loss of popularity, or the attractions of personal ambitions? Just remember how, when Republican and Democrat alike in the State of Ohio went crazy over the financial heresies, this man stood with his feet on a rock, demanding and vindicating an honest policy. Why, about six years ago I sat next, during a Congress, one of the leading Republican Representatives from the State of Ohio, who had an elaborate table to show how badly the West had been treated in the matter of currency, by showing how much each portion

of the country had in the way of bank bills authorized to be issued to the square mile, to show we had a great deal more in New England than they had in Ohio, and in the Southwest they were a great deal worse off even than in Ohio. In regard to the great questions of human rights, General Garfield has been as inflexible. He was the successor of Joshua R. Giddings, the man upon whom the mantle of that old prophet descended, but still he never has been partisan. The best statement and argument in favor of the reform of the Civil Service will be found in the speeches of General Garfield. He was one of the earliest and the foremost advocates of building up the educational institutions in the South at the national charge.

Do you wish, in addition to a statesman, to pay honor to that character most deserving of honor in this republic, the volunteer citizen soldier? Here is a man who enlisted in the beginning of the war, who became, from a subordinate officer, a major-general, always trusted by the best commanders—Thomas and Rosecrans—always in the thickest of the fight, always conducting successfully dangerous and difficult expeditions, coming home crowned with military glory. Do you wish in the republic to honor the man whose career vindicates the system of republican government; the man who for himself, without the aid of rank, or of wealth, or of family connection, or of external aid, raises himself from the humblest to the loftiest place? Do you think that Mr. Tilden, sitting like a spider in Gramercy Park, spinning his web and wrecking his railroads, can enter into competition with the simple and touching story of the canal boy and the carpenter? It is a life like that of Abraham Lincoln and like that of Daniel Webster, which appeals to every affectionate chord in the heart of the American citizen. So, my friends, I think that I have at least this claim to a friendly greeting at your hands—that I am one of a body of men who had the good fortune to do well the work which the Republican party intrusted to them.

II.

HON. CARL SCHURZ.

EXTRACTS from his speech, delivered in Indianapolis, July 20, 1880 :

In this way the Republican party, steadily progressing in an enlightened perception of the principles of sound finance, has become the reliable sound-money party of the country, to which, as parties now are, the solution of new financial problems can alone be safely trusted. And how magnificently do the effects of the results already achieved appear in the revival of our business prosperity!

It may be said that our financial policy has not wholly originated that prosperity. True, but it has most powerfully aided it by giving us that confidence which is impossible without staple money values and a sound currency system. And what prudent man would now risk these great results by turning over our financial policy to the hands of a party which, as I have shown, is the refuge of all destructive elements, threatening new uncertainty and confusion?

Indeed, not only in the traditions and good sense of the Republican party do you find the best security there is at present for the sanctity of our national faith, as well as a successful management of the financial policy; you find equal security in the known opinions and principles of its candidate, James A. Garfield. His convictions on these subjects have not found their first and best proclamation in the platform of his party or in his letter of acceptance. His record of nearly twenty years of Congressional service is not a blank on the great questions of the times, like that of his opponent. There is not a phase of the question of our National obligations, there is not a point of financial policy, from the first day that the subject was considered in Congress since he became a member of that body to the present hour, that he has not discussed with an ability and strength, a lucidity of argument, aptitude of knowledge, and firmness of conviction, placing him in the first rank of the defenders of sound principles.

If you want to study the reasons why the public faith should be inviolably maintained,

why an irredeemable paper currency is, and always has been, a curse to all the economic interests of this and all other countries, why confidence can be restored and maintained, why business can obtain a healthy development, why foreign commerce can be most profitably conducted only with a money system of staple and intrinsic value, you will find in the speeches of James A. Garfield upon this subject the most convincing information. You will find there opinions, not suddenly made up to order to suit an opportunity and the necessities of a candidate in an election, but the convictions of a lifetime carefully matured by conscientious research and large inquiry, and maintained with powerful reason, before they had become generally popular. You find there a teacher, statesman, and leader in a great movement, with principles so firmly grounded in his mind as well as his conscience that he would uphold them even were they not supported by a powerful party at his back. There is double assurance, therefore, in the traditions and acts of the party, and in the character of the leader at its head.

Is the Presidency, like a presentation sword, or a gift horse, or a donation of money, or a country house, given to a victorious soldier to please him? If so, then simple justice would compel us to look for the most meritorious of our soldiers and reward them in the order of their merit; and brave and skillful as General Hancock has been, there are others who have claims of a still higher order. Then, General Grant having already been President, we should reward General Sherman and Lieutenant-General Sheridan first, before we come to the Major-General nominated by the Democratic party. Certainly, let us be grateful; but let us not degrade the highest and most responsible trust of the Republic to the level of a mere gift of gratitude. Let military heroes be lifted up to the highest rank in the service which belongs to the soldier. Let them be rewarded with the esteem of their countrymen; and, if need be, let wealth and luxury be showered upon them to brighten that life which they were ready to sacrifice for their country. But let it never be forgotten that the Presidency is a trust that is due to no man; that nobody has ever

earned it as a thing belonging to him; and that it should not be bestowed but for services to be rendered in the way of patriotic and enlightened statesmanship.

But, above all things, the Presidency should never be pointed out as the attainable goal of ambition to the professional soldier. I certainly do not mean to depreciate the high character of the regular army. But I can not refrain from saying that, in a republic like ours, great care should be taken not to demoralize it by instilling political ambition into the minds of its officers. The army is there to obey the orders of the civil power under the law as it stands, without looking to the right or the left. And it will be an evil day for this Republic when we inspire the generals of our army with the ambition to secure the highest power by paving their way to it with political pronouncements. I will not impute to General Hancock any such design. He may have meant ever so well when he issued General Order No. 40, which is now held up by a political party as his principal title to the Presidency. But you once establish such a precedent, and who knows how long it will be before you hear of other general orders issued for purposes somewhat similar to those for which they are now issued in Mexico? I am for the subordination of the military to the civil power. And therefore I am for making Congressman Garfield President, and for letting General Hancock remain what he is, a general, always ready to draw the soldier's sword at the lawful command of the civil power.

What have we on the other hand in the Republican candidate? His youth was that of a poor boy. He lived by his daily labor. He rose up from that estate gradually by his own effort, taking with him the experience of poverty and hard work, and a living sympathy with the poor and hard-working man. He cultivated his mind by diligent study, and he stored it with useful knowledge. From a learner he became a teacher. When the Republic called her sons to her defense, he joined the army and achieved distinction in active service as one of the brave on the battle-field. He was called into the great council of the nation, and has sat there for nearly twenty years. No great question was

discussed without his contributing the store of his knowledge to the fund of information necessary for wise decision. His speeches have ranked not only among the most eloquent, but among the most instructive and useful. Scarcely a single great measure of legislation was passed during that long period without the imprint of his mind. No man in Congress has devoted more thorough inquiry to a larger number of important subjects, and formed upon them opinions more matured and valuable. He was not as great a soldier as his competitor for the Presidency, but he has made himself, and is universally recognized as what a President ought to be, a statesman. He understands all phases of life, from the lowest to the highest, for he has lived through them. He understands the great problems of politics, for he has studied them and actively participated in their discussion and solution. Few men in this country would enter the Presidential office, with its great duties and responsibilities, better or even as well equipped with knowledge and experience. He need only be true to his record in order to become a wise, safe, and successful President. If the people elect him, it will be only because his services rendered in the past are just of that nature which will give assurances of his ability to render greater service in the future. The country wants a statesman of ability, knowledge, experience, and principle at the head of affairs. His conduct as a legislator gives ample guarantee of great promise in all these things.

III.

MR. G. A. TOWNSEND.

MR. GEORGE ALFRED TOWNSEND, better known perhaps as "Gath," telegraphed the following estimate of General Garfield's character to the "Cincinnati Enquirer" the night after the Chicago nomination:

The writer has known General Garfield pretty well for thirteen years. He is a large, well-fed, hale, ruddy, brown-bearded man, weighing about two hundred and twenty pounds, with Ohio German colors, blue eyes, military face, erect figure and shoulders,

large back and thighs, and broad chest, and evidently bred in the country on a farm. His large mouth is full of strong teeth; his nose, chin, and brow are strongly pronounced. A large brain, with room for play of thought and long application, rises high above his clear, discerning, enjoying eyes. He sometimes suggests a country Samson—strong beyond his knowledge, but unguarded as a school-boy. He pays little attention to the affectation by which some men manage public opinion, and has one kind of behavior for all callers, which is the most natural behavior at hand. Strangers would think him a little cold and mentally shy. On acquaintance he is seen to be hearty above everything, loving the life around him, his family, his friends, his State and country. Loving sympathetic and achieving people, and with a large unprofessing sense of the brotherhood of workers in the fields of progress, it was the feeling of sympathy and the desire to impart which took him for chief; while as to the pulpit, or on the verge of it, full of all that he saw and acquired, he panted to give it forth, after it had passed through the alembic of his mind. Endowed with a warm temperament, copious expression, large, wide-seeing faculties, and superabundant health, he could study all night and teach or lecture all day; and it was a providence that his neighbors discovered he was too much of a man to conceal in the pulpit, where his docility and reverence had almost taken him. They sent him to the State Legislature, where he was when the war broke out; and he immediately went to the field, where his courage and painstaking parts, and love of open-air occupation, and perfect freedom from self-assertion, made him the delight of Rosecrans and George H. Thomas successively. He would go about any work they asked of him, was unselfish and enthusiastic, and had steady, temperate habits, and his large brain and his reverence made everything novel to him. There is an entire absence of nonchalance or worldliness about his nature. He is never indifferent, never vindictive. A base action, or ingratitude, or cruelty, may make him sad, but does not provoke retaliation, nor alter that faith in men or Providence which is a part of his sound stomach and athletic head.

Garfield is simple as a child; to the serpent's wisdom he is a stranger. Having no use nor aptitude with the weapons of coarser natures, he often avoids mere disputes, does not go to public resorts where men are familiar or vulgar, and the walk from his home in Washington to the Capitol and an occasional dinner out comprise his life. The word public servant especially applies to him. He has been the drudge of his State constituents, the public, the public societies, the moral societies, and of his party and country, since 1868. Aptitude for public debate and public affairs is associated with a military nature in him. He is on a broad scale a schoolmaster of the range of Gladstone, of Agassiz, of Gallatin. With as honest a heart as ever beat above the competitors of sordid ambition, General Garfield has yet so little of the worldly wise in him that he is poor, and yet has been accused of dishonesty. He has no capacity for investment, nor the rapid solution of wealth, nor profound respect for the penny in and out of pound, and still is neither careless, improvident, nor dependent. The great consuming passion to equal richer people and live finely, and extend his social power, is as foreign to him as scheming or cheating. But he is not a suspicious nor a high-mettled man, and so he is taken in sometimes, partly from his obliging, unrefusing disposition. Men who were scheming imposed upon him as upon Grant and other crude-eyed men of affairs. The people of his district, who are quick to punish public venality or defection, heard him in his defense of 1873, and kept him in Congress and held up his hand, and hence he is by their unwavering support for twenty-five years candidate for President and a national character. Since John Quincy Adams no President has had Garfield's scholarship, which is equally up to this age of wider facts. The average American, pursuing money all day long, is now presented to a man who has invariably put the business of others above his own, and worked for that alleged nondescript, the public gratitude, all his life. But he has not labored without reward. The great nomination came to-day to as pure and loving a man as ever wished well to anybody and put his shoulder to his neighbor's wheel. Garfield's big, boy-

ish heart is pained to-night with the weight of his obligation, affection, and responsibility. To-day, as hundreds of telegrams came from everywhere, saying kind, strong things to him—such messages as only Americans in their rapid, good impulses pour upon a lucky friend—he was with two volunteer clerks in a room opening and reading; and suddenly, his two boys sent him one—little fellows at school—and as he read it he broke down, and tried to talk, but his voice choked, and he could not see for tears. The clerks began to blubber too, and people to whom they afterward told it. This sense of real great heart will be new to the country, and will grow if he gets the Presidency. His wife was one of his scholars in Ohio. Like him, she is of a New England family transplanted to the West, a pure-hearted, brave, unassuming woman, the mother of seven or eight children, and, as he told me only a few weeks ago, had never by any remark brought him into any trouble, while she was unstampedable by any clamor.

He is the ablest public speaker in the country, and the most serious and instructive man on the stump. His instincts, liberal and right; his courtesy, noticeable in our politics; his aims, ingenuous; and his piety comes by nature. He leads a farmer's life all the recess of Congress, working like a field-hand, and restoring his mind by resting it. If elected, he will give a tone of culture and intelligence to the executive office it has never yet had, while he has no pedantry in his composition, and no conceit whatever. General Garfield may be worth twenty-five thousand dollars, or a little more than Mr. Lincoln was when he took office. His old mother, a genial lady, lives in his family, and his kindness to her on every occasion bears out the commandment of "Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land."

 IV.

ROSECRANS ON GARFIELD.

RECENTLY a "San Francisco Call" reporter visited General W. S. Rosecrans at his residence in that city, and obtained from him some interesting facts concerning the milita-

ry career of the Republican nominee. "Yes," replied General Rosecrans, in response to an inquiry from the "Call" representative, "Garfield was a member of my military family during the early part of the war. When he came to my headquarters I must confess I had a prejudice against him, as I understood he was a preacher who had gone into politics, and a man of that cast I was naturally opposed to. He remained at headquarters a couple of days, as I wanted to become acquainted with him before assigning him to duty. The more I saw of him the better I liked him, and finally I gave him his choice of a brigade or to become my Chief of Staff. Most men would have probably taken the brigade, but he decided to remain with me. We were together until the Chattanooga affair. I found him to be a competent and efficient officer, an earnest and devoted patriot, and a man of the highest honor. His views were large, and he was possessed of a thoroughly comprehensive mind. Late in the summer of 1863 he came to me one day, and said that he had been asked to accept the Republican nomination for Congress from the Ashtabula District, and asked my advice as to whether he ought to accept it, and whether he could do so honorably. I replied that I not only thought he could accept it with honor, but that I deemed it his duty to do so. The war is not yet over, I said, nor will it be for some time to come. There will be many questions arising in Congress which require not only statesmanlike treatment, but the advice of men having an acquaintance with military affairs will be needed; and for that and several other reasons that I named, he would, I believed, do equally as good service to his country in Congress as in the field. It was, too, a great honor to him to be nominated by the Ashtabula District, which had been represented in the House by one man for a quarter of a century (Joshua R. Giddings); they were thoroughly acquainted with him, and he was in accord with their sentiments in politics. Before the interview closed I said to him: 'Garfield, I want to give you some advice. When you go to Congress, be careful what you say. Don't talk too much; but when you do talk, speak to the point. Be true to yourself, and you will make your mark before the country.'

A few years ago I met him in Washington, and said to him: 'Well, Garfield, you have got along pretty well following my advice.'

Recurring to the nomination, General Rosecrans said: "I consider Garfield head and shoulders above any of the men named before the Convention, and far superior to any of the political managers upon the floor. He is a man with broad views, has always been a consistent Republican, and has a clear record. I can not believe that James A. Garfield was ever guilty of a dishonest act. As the campaign progresses, it will be found, if it is not now acknowledged, that Garfield is a hard man to beat."

V.

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN LEAGUE.

THE National Republican League has issued the following circular to "independent voters":

PHILADELPHIA, *June 26th.*—The issues of the Presidential canvass are now fully defined, and every voter can determine for himself the line of action which the highest interests of the country require. In the judgment of the National Republican League, there should be no hesitation.

The Democracy, with strange inconsistency, have adopted the expedient of nominating a man whose only training has been that of the army, and whose reputation, solely military, is the precise measure of his unfitness for the highest civil position in the gift of the people.

On the other hand, the friends of good government have every reason to be satisfied with the nomination of General Garfield, and with the manner in which it was secured. Their determination to support him ought to be intensified by the alternative presented. Simple acquiescence in the Chicago ticket, however, is not enough. In the coming canvass there is no place for the lukewarmers or indifferents. The zealous and united efforts of all who look with repugnance on Democratic methods and measures will be requisite to preserve the country from the worst of all evils.

The solid South requires the aid of but two Northern States to give the Democracy

a majority in the Electoral College; and there are many devices through which the united action of both Houses of Congress may set aside the verdict of the people, if that verdict is not rendered so emphatically as to preclude all recourse to chicanery.

The attempted capture of Maine shows that the Democratic party is prepared to use any means that may enable it to gain possession of the Executive Department, with its limitless opportunities of expenditure and patronage.

We may reasonably anticipate events which will strain our institutions to the utmost, and lead to dangers which no lover of his country can contemplate without the gravest alarm. To avert these dangers it is not enough that our candidate shall be fairly and honestly elected; his majority must be such that on no pretext can it be set aside. For this every vote is needed, and every voter should use his influence to arouse his friends to the necessity of vigorous and united action. If with such a candidate as General Garfield, nominated under the most favorable auspices, we shall fail, we may well fear for the result of any effort in the future to prevent the decadence of our public life.

It is, moreover, of high importance that a Republican Executive should be supported by a Republican House of Representatives, in order to uphold financial honesty and industrial prosperity; and with proper effort a working majority in Congress may be easily regained. The power which makes and unmakes parties and regulates our national policy lies in the hands of that comparatively small numbers of voters who cast their ballots on either side, or who abstain from voting, as their sense of duty dictates. To this conscience vote we confidently appeal, believing that every patriotic motive requires that it should earnestly and zealously support the Republican Electoral Ticket.

By order of the Executive Committee.

WM. ROTCH WISTER, *Chairman*.

HAMPTON L. CARSON, *Secretary*.

VI.

"THE NATION."

EXTRACTS from an article in No. 781 :

Usually "the dark horse" is a gentleman about whom the public has everything to learn. In fact, to make a horse "dark," it may be said to be necessary that he should not have been prominent in public affairs, and that the revelation of his greatness and of his claims to public confidence should have to be made by the campaign biographer and the party newspapers during the canvass. General Garfield is, however, one of the best-known men in public life, and is known in an excellent way. We have several times of late spoken in these columns of the growing tendency of politicians to neglect real politics—that is, *the business* of the country—for the work of electioneering and management, and of the growing disposition on the part of the public to let politicians of this class take possession of the Government and use it in their own game for their own hands. The Independent opposition to the nomination of Grant and Blaine and to the dictation of the Bosses was really in large part a protest against this tendency, and an attempt once more to force politicians to occupy themselves with politics, and earn their honors by their attention to public affairs. General Garfield's political career has, however, been as far as possible removed from that of the ordinary manager and machinist. His life in Congress has really been that of a statesman of the earlier constructive type. We do not profess to know what it is in his relations with his district which has enabled him to give so much of his time to the proper business of a legislator without endangering his political prospects, but we do know that he is most honorably associated with every question of importance which has come up in Congress during the past twelve years. Everybody who has given even slight attention to politics knows what his opinions are on nearly every matter by which the public mind has been much stirred since 1868, and we can recall no such matter on which his opinions were not sound, or, if not sound according to our way of thinking, were not defended so as to show that they

had been carefully and intelligently formed. On the currency question he has never for one moment gone astray, and never for one moment concealed his view of the highest expediency. He never gave any countenance, as nearly every prominent Republican politician did, to the plan of paying the bonds in paper. He opposed the Silver Bill almost alone among the Republicans, in the teeth of the craze which was sweeping over the whole West, especially his own State, on this subject. He was one of the earliest and most strenuous advocates of civil-service reform, even in the sense in which the Independent Republicans have of late been preaching it. His position toward the South since the war, which for a time caused him to be frowned on by the clique who were trying to build up their personal fortunes by fanning the flames of civil strife, as a heretic and blasphemer, has placed him on this subject almost alone among Republican politicians in the serene air of the highest statesmanship.

... General Garfield has done better than commit Burke to memory: he has appropriated his spirit and ideas, and has had the courage to produce them at a time when some of the leading men of his party were energetically illustrating Burke's maxim that "a great empire and little minds go ill together." When that great scandal of free government—the doctrine that the President withdrew the troops from the South *mero motu*, as the Czar might reduce the garrison of Warsaw, and that Southerners ought therefore to have voted the Republican ticket out of "gratitude"—was being spread abroad by both press and politicians, General Garfield was bold enough to say that the true justification of the President's course was that he had done what it was his constitutional duty to do. In saying this he did more than defend Mr. Hayes. he reminded his own party that this is a Government of law, and that there is under it no place for gratitude to an executive officer except in the case of a pardoned criminal. In fact, the steady constitutionality and rationality, if we may use the expression, of General Garfield's course in Congress during times when most of his fellow Republicans lost their heads have been very remarkable,

and show that he is not only a man of courage, but that he does not, in the strife and turmoil of what is called practical politics, lose his hold on the great truth that this Nation, in spite of its enormous natural advantages, must live, as every other human society has lived, by remembering, comparing, and foreseeing.

VII.

JUDGE J. S. BLACK'S TWO LETTERS.

PHILADELPHIA, February 15, 1878.

MY DEAR SIR: From the beginning of the investigation concerning Mr. Ames's use of the *Crédit Mobilier*, I believed that General Garfield was free from all guilty connection with that business. This opinion was founded not merely on my confidence in his integrity, but on some special knowledge of his case. I may have told you all about it in conversation, but I desire now to repeat it by way of reminder.

I assert unhesitatingly that, whatever General Garfield may have done or forbore to do, he acted in profound ignorance of the nature and character of the thing which Mr. Ames was proposing to sell. He had not the slightest suspicion that he was to be taken into a ring organized for the purpose of defrauding the public; nor did he know that the stock was in any manner connected with anything which came, or could come, within the legislative jurisdiction of Congress. The case against him lacks the *scienter* which alone constitutes guilt.

In the winter of 1869-'70 I told General Garfield of the fact that his name was on Ames's list; that Ames charged him with being one of his distributees; explained to him the character, origin, and objects of the *Crédit Mobilier*; pointed out the connection it had with Congressional legislation, and showed him how impossible it was for a member of Congress to hold stock in it without bringing his private interests in conflict with his public duty. That all this was to him a perfectly new revelation I am as sure as I can be of such a fact, or of any fact which is capable of being proved only by moral circumstances. He told me then the whole story of Train's offer to him and Ames's subsequent solicitation, and his own

action in the premises, *much as he details it to the Committee*. I do not undertake to reproduce the conversation, but the effect of it all was to convince me thoroughly that when he listened to Ames he was perfectly unconscious of anything evil. I watched carefully every word that fell from him on this point, and did not regard his narrative of the transaction in other respects with much interest, because in my view everything else was insignificant. I did not care whether he had made a bargain technically binding or not; his integrity depended upon the question whether he acted with his eyes open. If he had known the true character of the proposition made to him, he would not have endured it, much less embraced it.

Now, couple this with Mr. Ames's admission that he gave no explanation whatever of the matter to General Garfield; then reflect that not a particle of proof exists to show that he learned anything about it previous to his conversation with me; and I think you will say that it is altogether unjust to put him on the list of those who knowingly and willfully joined the fraudulent association in question.

J. S. BLACK.

Hon J G BLAINE, *Speaker of the House of Representatives*.

HOTEL CONTINENTAL, PARIS, June 28, 1880.

To the Editor of the Philadelphia Times.

MY DEAR SIR: I have regularly received the "Times" since I have been on this side, and through it I have learned all I know about the situation at home. I am informed fully concerning the nomination at Chicago, and did not need much information about the character and history of the candidate there set up, *my personal acquaintance with him being tolerably full and intimate*.

Your express determination to see that General Garfield shall be defended against all unjust aspersions upon his personal character, is equally pleasant reading to me, for *I have been his devoted friend for many years, and I am resolved that I never will believe that he does not deserve the affection I have bestowed upon him*. If he would carry the principles which regulate his private life into his public conduct, he would *make the best Chief Magistrate we have ever had*. But he will act for the interests of his party, as he

has acted all his lifetime, and that will require him to take the advice which Stevens gave to Montpelius in the buckshot war. I do not know any *really good man* who has done and assisted in doing so many bad things *in politics* as General Garfield. . . .

I am very truly yours,

J. S. BLACK

VIII.

COLONEL DONN PIATT.

COLONEL DONN PIATT, editor of "The Capitol" (Washington), has often attacked General Garfield with great vehemence. Nevertheless, in his issue of June 20th he bore this testimony:

Garfield's friends should study his record and understand his case before rushing to his support. In their ignorance they are doing him more harm than good.

He is assailed in two cases—one the Crédit Mobilier, and the other the De Golyer patent.

Both can be stated briefly and clearly, and the facts clear Garfield of any wrong.

Here is the Crédit Mobilier: Oakes Ames had seized on and held a large amount of stock that Harry McComb claimed and sued for. Ames's little game was this: If the suit went against him, he intended to account for the stock, as lobby agent, in a distribution of it "where it would do the most good." If he won, he intended to hold the stock as his own. He prepared for this by going just far enough with members of Congress to lay a foundation for his claim, but not far enough to enable the members to force him to give them the stock should he win against McComb.

Thus, when Garfield borrowed three hundred dollars to pay his house-rent, Ames entered the amount in his little book as so much stock, that was well worth half a million at the time. When the explosion occurred Ames swore that the money was not a loan, but cash paid for stock never delivered, the dividends on which would have made Garfield comfortable; not a cent of which did he receive, nor had it ever been intimated to him that he had a right to it.

It was Ames's oath against Garfield's,

with all the circumstances in Garfield's favor, with the more significant one, that while Garfield's character was unimpeachable, Ames was a confessed briber of Congressmen, and about as corrupt an old man as the Lord permitted to cumber the earth. To take the oath of such a man against the word of an honest man is simply monstrous, and only shows to what extent partisan zeal can carry a people.

In the De Golyer case Garfield was paid a retainer of five thousand dollars—not to influence his vote as a Congressman, or his power as Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for all the appropriations had passed before he was paid. The object of the influence was in Chicago.

The De Golyer company of the last-named place had employed one Chittenden to secure contracts with the Territorial Government. In making up his bill, Chittenden claimed of the company for important services greatly exaggerated, and among those, securing the influence of Garfield. This was done really through Dick Parsons, who was one of the attorneys for the company, and promised Garfield one half of his fee if he (Garfield) would take charge of the case during his (Parsons's) absence, Parsons being called home by the sickness of his family. Dick did not say what his fee was, and long after the whole affair was settled Dick paid over the five thousand.

Considering the rate of charges indulged in by eminent lawyers, there is nothing in the amount to excite surprise or suspicion.

Had Garfield been animated in either case by corrupt motives, the world would never have heard of either case; and instead of being a man in moderate circumstances, Garfield has held positions where, as we have said, he could have winked himself into millions, as others have done who walk among men without the shadow of a taint upon their names.

IX.

HON. WM. SPRINGER.

REMARKS of Hon. Wm. Springer, Democratic Congressman, at Sullivan, Ind., July 4, 1880:

My friends, the Republican party has

nominated for its candidate for President James A. Garfield of Ohio, a man who has long been in public service, long been the leader of his party, and who stands to-day the mightiest warrior of them all, the greatest Republican member of the Lower House of Congress. I know James A. Garfield by being with him in the Lower House of Congress for years, and I know there is no Republican in that party abler than he. I see that the newspapers are making charges against his character, but, my friends, I can not say they are in any wise true. I have not read the reply by the Republican press to these charges; if they are true, I do not know it.

I must say to you, my friends, that I had hoped the good old Democratic party would select a civilian for its standard-bearer in this campaign, as I think it would have been more preferable to me than to have a man who is solely a military man.

The President of the United States should be a man who knows all about civil affairs; who knows the regulations of the various departments; the management of the Judiciary, Legislative, and Executive Departments; the Department of State, which deals with foreign countries; the Treasury Department with the millions of treasure; with civil service; and with the great, rapidly growing commerce of our land, thereby bringing the greatest happiness to our people. I therefore thought the best interests of our people demanded a man experienced in civil affairs, and when our convention at Cincinnati nominated a purely military man, I must confess to you, my friends, I thought it would have been better to have nominated a man with some civil experience.

X.

HON. R. MILTON SPEER.

HON. R. MILTON SPEER, Democratic member of the Forty-third Congress from Pennsylvania, and recent Chairman of the Democratic State Committee, on his return from Cincinnati, addressed a Democratic ratification meeting at Pittsburgh, in the course of which he remarked:

This is my first public utterance since the Chicago nomination, and I desire to say

right here that I served four years in Congress with General Garfield. I know him well, and I honor him for his honesty, his integrity, his ability, his breadth of knowledge, and his upright character. But he represents the party of sectionalism, while General Hancock represents a united North and South.

XI.

HON. HENRY B. PAYNE.

HON. HENRY B. PAYNE, a prominent candidate for the Presidential nomination at Cincinnati, in a recently published interview, just after the Chicago Convention, spoke as follows:

You know General Garfield well enough, then, to be convinced one way or the other in regard to his personal probity?

It isn't likely (said Mr. Payne, slowly and gravely) that I would continue to respect and admit to my intercourse any man whom I believed guilty of deliberate dishonor. No, I have never examined the specific charges against Garfield, nor acquainted myself with his defense against them. From my knowledge of his character, however, I should be decidedly inclined to believe that he was deceived rather than guilty—that his ignorance of business affairs and methods was to blame for any error. Nothing in his outward life denotes that he has profited by corruption. He lives economically; the present improve-

ments on his house at Mentor—which may cost some three thousand dollars—involve the most considerable expenditures his neighbors are aware of. No, no. With General Garfield's political creed I am utterly at variance; but this does not counsel me to an unconsidered assault upon that candidate's private honor.—*New York World*.

XII.

HON. A. G. THURMAN AND THE
"NEW YORK WORLD."

HON. A. G. THURMAN, long leader of the Ohio Democracy, in the autumn of 1873 bore this testimony:

Oakes Ames swears that Garfield got ten shares, and Garfield swears that he did not do anything of the kind. There was a good deal of talk, but no proof against him; and I am compelled to say that Garfield gets out better than any one else, and, on the whole, there was not sufficient evidence to fasten corruption at his door.

Thurman's opinion appeared in the "New York World" of October 10, 1873.

That Democratic journal added its own opinion as follows:

After considering all the testimony, on the whole, we concur in this view of Mr. Garfield's connection with the Credit Mobilier.

PART V.

THE RELIGIOUS PRESS.

It is peculiarly gratifying to note the strong hold that General Garfield has taken of the religious mind of the country. That he has taken such hold appears plainly in the religious press. Some of the voices are found below.

I.

Christian Standard (Cincinnati, Ohio), June 12th and 19th.

We are glad to say, however, that there are men who rise above this turmoil, and stand in calm poise and grandeur far above such methods and such men; and it is with the utmost pleasure that we recognize among them, preëminent, J. A. Garfield, to whom it was committed to name to the Convention one of the principal candidates. His speech will stand as a model, apart by itself, as the one gem of the occasion. It is no wonder that among the spectators there was developed a strong sentiment that he himself was the man for the hour. At every crisis in the Convention his voice is heard, for principle, for sobriety, for prudence and honor. We regret that we have not the space to reproduce his speech here, but we shall probably give it hereafter. We think it will commend itself to the good sense and patriotism of men of all parties. And if ever he is named for a great office, we can not ask more than that it shall be as fitly done.

On account, we presume, of our known long acquaintance with the candidate of the Republican party for the Presidency, and the personal friendship existing between us, we are already besieged with questions

touching every rumor put in circulation by his political opponents to his injury. Ours is not a political paper, and we have nothing to say in these columns touching the party issues between Republicans and Democrats. But as touching the character of James A. Garfield as an honest man, a Christian gentleman, an upright, loyal, and faithful citizen, and a statesman of great ability, of high integrity, and of pure morals, we are free to say, as the result of a long and intimate personal acquaintance, that we have in him, and have always had, unbounded confidence—a confidence that has never trembled for a moment. In a letter received from Bro. F. D. Power, for many years our preacher in Washington, and who has occasion to know him well, he says of General Garfield, “He is a good, pure man, and we love him.” Let this suffice. We hope the Democrats will give us a candidate equally able and worthy, and that the campaign will be conducted with reference to principles rather than persons, and be free from personal warfare.

II.

The American Christian Review (Cincinnati, Ohio), June 22d.

General James A. Garfield, recently nominated by the Chicago Republican Convention for the Presidency of the United States, is a member of the Church of Christ, and has been for about thirty years. He will soon be fifty years of age. We are glad to record the fact that, besides being a statesman of acknowledged ability, his pri-

vate life has been pure, and that his Christian character is without a stain. If the Democratic party shall nominate a man for the same exalted position bearing as clean a record in morals and sobriety as that of Garfield, the nation may well have cause to rejoice. We have known Bro. Garfield personally for twenty-five years, and during all that time have known him as an humble Christian, unpretentious in his profession, magnanimous and liberal-hearted, honest, faithful, and philanthropic, with a head and heart ready to serve in the humblest cause of humanity. The last time we were in Washington city we found him teaching a Bible-class in the Sunday-school of a very obscure church. He is one of the biggest-hearted Christian men we ever met. We have spoken these few words in praise of Bro. Garfield as a Christian citizen, and not as a politician, because we think our brethren at large feel pleased that so distinguished an honor has been conferred on one of our brethren. It does not belong to the character of the "Review" to speak of his politics or of his political creed. That information must be found in political organs.

III.

The Christian Union (New York), June 16th.

The nomination of General Garfield was made by the men who did not attend the Convention which apparently nominated him. He was nominated by the people, not by the politicians. His nomination is a new attestation of the political value of moral qualities. The Republican party has passed by the eminent soldier, the eminent financier, and the eminent party politician, to take up a man who is chiefly eminent for the Christian purity and integrity of his life and character. They are without reproach and above suspicion, though, of course, not above slander; for the morning after the nomination the opposition began its campaign of calumny. If Moses were nominated for the Presidency, there are papers which would bring up the charge that he murdered an Egyptian, and ran off with the Egyptian women's jewelry.

What enthusiasm the nomination will

arouse remains to be seen, but it will at least excite no opposition within the Republican party, and will give measurable satisfaction to all its sections. The believers in a continuous tenure of office will see in General Garfield a representative of their cure for the strife of factions. For General Garfield not only comes from a district which believes in third and fourth terms, but his eminence in American politics is due to that fact. The Western Reserve has, in a period of half a century, been represented by but four men; General Garfield has been their representative for a period of eighteen years—from 1862 to the present time. For the last two sessions of the House of Representatives he has been the leader of the Republican party in the House. To call such a man a "dark horse" is absurd. The leader of the House is the natural leader of his party when it comes into power, and in England is almost always made Prime Minister as a matter of course.

The advocates of Civil Service Reform must be hard to suit if they are not pleased with the nomination of a man who has never sought an office. When first elected to the House of Representatives he was with the troops in the field, and did not know that a nomination was contemplated until he was informed that it was given. When, last fall, his name was before the Ohio Legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate, in competition with several men of no little eminence in national politics, his friends were urgent that he should go to Columbus and take rooms there, to be near the Legislature at the critical moment. He refused; he never had sought an office, and would not begin then; remained at his farm; and won more votes by his wise independence than he could have won by wire-pulling, for he was elected without opposition within his party. At the Convention which has just nominated him, he steadfastly declined to be a candidate, and was finally declared the choice of the Convention against his protests, and because of his genuine and hearty devotion to the interests of his party and the promotion of its principles. At the same time he is a practical politician; he does not belong to the "scratchers"; he has always acted with his party; he has always been simply a Re-

publican — not an “Independent Republican,” nor a “Young Republican,” nor a “Stalwart Republican,” nor a “Bloody Shirt Republican.” He possesses the political purity and integrity which President Hayes possesses, and a skill in managing men which President Hayes lacks. Both qualities were strikingly manifested in the Convention which he did so much to harmonize and which finally nominated him.

The believers in paper money, if there are any such left in the Republican party, are the only ones likely to be dissatisfied. General Garfield has been always and consistently a hard-money man. In the time when Ohio was most doubtful on this point, he never wavered. His record in this respect is like that of President Hayes.

General Garfield is an earnest Christian man; a member of the Disciples, or Campbellites, a denomination very numerous in the West and Southwest; has never been ashamed of his faith; has often preached, though he has never been professionally a preacher; and has always carried his religious principles into his political life. He has the respect of those who most widely differ from him in political views; and the spontaneous meeting held in the House of Representatives by its members, to send him their congratulations on his nomination, was equally creditable to him and to the moral sense of the House.

The nomination of such a man is a rebuke to the croakers, and a testimony to the political power of moral sentiment in the American community. For twenty years the dominant political party has taken up and presented for the suffrages of the American people men whose first element of strength lay in their acknowledged moral worth. Abraham Lincoln, U. S. Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes, and James A. Garfield, whatever may be thought of their political principles and their political abilities, represent the highest moral elements and convictions of the community as applied to public questions. In character they compare favorably with the foremost statesmen of foreign countries, and with the foremost statesmen of our own earlier national life.

IV.

The Methodist (New York), June 19th.

The nomination of General Garfield by the Republicans suggests many useful reflections. It is, of course, a satisfaction to all Republicans that they can unite next November; and our present impression is that the union will embrace all or nearly all the Independent or Liberal Republicans. We shall probably take no part in the discussions; and we make haste to say that efforts to prove General Garfield a corrupt man can not, in our judgment, succeed. Perhaps the excellent use of certain stories about him—which we do not believe—may be to exclude mud-throwing from the canvass. If the Democrats make a good nomination, as good a one as this in personal character, both sides may perceive the folly of laying stress upon doubtful circumstances in lives characterized by uprightness and fidelity to public duty.

One of the best uses of this nomination may be to call out a strong Democratic nomination. It would certainly be vastly useful to have candidates on both sides whose purity and probity were not questioned. We should like to feel that, whatever political dangers might arise from the election of either, the White House would continue to shelter a model Christian home, and that the American people had with substantial unity, by the choice of their candidates, approved decency and honor in public life.

It is a great lesson, a mighty encouragement, that, once more, a poor boy approaches the highest office in the land; that one half of our people have selected for the chief place a man whose success is the fruit of his own character and deeds. We would not disfranchise the sons of the wealthy, nor disparage those who have inherited honored names, but it is nevertheless a glory of our country that it has Lincolns and Garfields; and the poor do well to rejoice in the success of the rail-splitters and canal-boys.

We hope that the majority of our readers agree with us that it is better not to have raised the third-term issue, better not to have selected any candidate for whom the primary and secondary conventions had been

organized, and in some cases excessively managed; better that Presidential lightning should strike a man who had not been worked for and organized for. This result is calculated to weaken the confidence and palsy the energy of the too active "political worker," whose power many of us have come to dread. We admit the necessity of organization: what we deprecate is organization for personal ends. When the great parties should pass into the hands of the managers, the power of the people would be greatly decreased, if not hopelessly lost.

We are not disposed to lament that this nomination renders it probable that the White House will cease to be a Methodist home. It has been ours for twelve years, and even the largest denomination ought cheerfully to take turns in this relation to the country. We have hope that a Christian family will inhabit the Presidential Mansion after next March; and we should be unreasonable if we felt grieved that the successor of Presidents Grant and Hayes is likely, in any case, to belong to another communion. General Garfield may not be elected, though the chances seem to be in his favor; but we do not expect the Democrats to nominate a Methodist; and the Methodists of both parties—and in the whole Union we are about equally divided between the parties—will zealously support good candidates without regard to their church affiliations. We do not believe that a hundred Methodist votes could be changed by this question; and we take great satisfaction in the fact that, as a denomination, we can make this boast. We wish it could be said of every denomination of Christians in the land. In taking a candidate from one of the small denominations, the Republican party asserts its belief that a truly catholic spirit pervades its ranks, and pays the highest compliment to the great religious bodies from whom it has not taken its candidates.



The Evangelist (New York), June 17th.

The great Convention at Chicago, to which the politicians have been looking forward with much eagerness for months past,

has come and gone, leaving many surprises behind it. Like some preceding Conventions, it has confounded the calculations of the wisest political seers, who have found all their prophecies falsified, their sagacity proved to be folly, and their towering ambitions brought to naught. In some respects the result has been not unlike that in the same city twenty years ago, when the nomination of Mr. Seward was defeated, and Abraham Lincoln for the first time appeared as a striking figure in American politics. Now, as then, the aspiring hopes of those who stood foremost—and, as they thought, almost alone—in the race are disappointed; and in place of the expectant "heirs to the succession," one comes to the front who, like Lincoln, is a stalwart "son of the forest," whom the leaders had left quite out of their calculations.

Of course the eyes of the country are at once turned upon the new candidate, and a million voices ask: Who and what is he? In this case it can not be pretended that he is "a dark horse," in the sense that he was before quite unknown. On the contrary, few of our public men have been more prominently before the country from the time that he entered the army at the beginning of the war, through his military career, and his long service in Congress, till the hour of his nomination at Chicago. For seventeen years he has been a member of the House of Representatives, in a position where a man very soon finds his level; where the strong naturally come to the front, while the weak as naturally fall to the rear. Such a position is one to expose a man's weakness and incapacity, if it does not show his ability and his character. What record he has made for himself in this position is a part of the history of the country.

But we do not propose to speak of General Garfield as the public know him, but as we know him, giving our own personal impressions for what they are worth. While "The Evangelist" takes no part in political contests, yet it is not indifferent to the character of our public men, and feels it to be a duty to contribute, as far as possible, to the information of its readers in regard to those for whom their votes are asked. With General Garfield we have had a personal ac-

quaintance for many years. He is a graduate of our *alma mater*, and we have met him at commencements, as well as in Washington. Not long ago he told us, very simply and modestly, the story of his early life, of his struggles to get an education; how, after studying in Ohio, he decided to come to an Eastern college, and wrote to several presidents to ask for information; and how the kind letter he received from Dr. Hopkins decided him to go to Williams College. It was a happy choice. Entering the junior class, he was there but two years, but during that time he had the invaluable instruction of that eminent teacher; and probably there is no man living for whom he feels more sincere veneration—a feeling of mingled respect and affection—than his old teacher, so honored and beloved, President Mark Hopkins.

In college he was one of the foremost. We have seen it stated in some paper that the richer students looked down upon him because of his poverty. But this we must believe to be a pure invention. At any rate, if a few smiled at the rough figure and coarse garments of the uncouth Westerner, he soon inspired a different feeling. There is no purer democracy in the world than in an American college—no place where young men who are “stuck up,” as the phrase is, elated by their wealth or social position, are sooner “taken down.” Money counts for little when brought in comparison, or in contrast, with personal qualities. The things which college students respect most are muscle and brains, physical strength and intellectual capacity. Garfield had both. He could hold his own anywhere—on the ball-ground, or in a rough-and-tumble, as well as in the class-room. If anybody affected to “look down” upon him, the supercilious youth would soon be taught to “look up” from his own position lying flat on his back. But he commanded respect not only by his strength and courage, but by his standing in his class. He was a good scholar, and especially a good debater; and when to these qualities it is added that he was also a devout Christian, it may well be supposed that his personal influence was excellent. The deference which college boys feel for physical prowess gives to

those who possess this *only* an evil ascendancy. There is no more dangerous man in such an institution than a great, hulking fellow, who, with his strength of limb, is vulgar and profane—a coarse, swearing, swaggering bully. Such a man sometimes demoralizes a whole college. But when one comes among young men, a giant in strength, yet pure in heart and clean of tongue, his physical qualities give a prodigious momentum to his religious influence.

Graduating in 1856, the young student returned to Ohio to engage in teaching, and occasionally in *preaching*, for the family belonged to the sect of Disciples, or Campbellites, which requires no ordination, and no course of theological study; and as he had special “gifts” for speaking in public, he “exercised his gifts” in the gatherings of his brethren. It was at this time that he married a lady who, though extremely modest and retiring, is well known to be highly educated, and full of the best womanly sense as well as womanly feeling. She has had a great influence over his subsequent career; and it is to the honor of the man that he ascribes much of his success to his wife. From these peaceful domestic scenes and this quiet life, he was called by the breaking out of the war. The moment the country was in danger, and had need of her sons, he entered the field, and rose to distinction. To this portion of his career we have no need to refer, as the chroniclers will recount it in the fullest details. We shall never forget an evening which he spent with us at Willard’s in Washington, at the close of the war, when he gave us a long and intensely interesting account of the battle of Chickamauga, in which he had taken part. The description was so minute and so vivid, that it has remained in our memory, leaving an impression more distinct than we have of any other battle of the war. He was the Chief of Staff of General Rosecrans, and when the army was defeated, and retiring in hot haste from the field, he heard the sound of cannon in the distance, which told him that General Thomas, who commanded the left, was still fighting to save the fortunes of the day; and, turning his horse, he rode straight to that part of the field, thinking perhaps, like Napoleon at Marengo, that

"though one battle was lost, there was time to gain another," and remained with that great commander till his stubborn resistance saved the army.

Since the war General Garfield's place has been in Congress, where he has been seen and known of all who have visited Washington. There he has gradually risen to the position of the leader of his party in the House of Representatives, not by pushing or ambition, but by the natural ascendancy accorded to superior ability. No man could command such a position, and hold it, without talents of a high order, the possession of which is now conceded to him by all—not only those of his own, but of the opposite party.

But no degree of success has ever changed the man. He has always been the same—simple in character and modest in manner, though with the consciousness of strength which comes with long experience of his power, yet with an utter absence of arrogance and pretension. He is preëminently a man of the people. Born in a very humble home, among the poor, all his sympathies are with them. He has no more pride than Lincoln had. Indeed, there are many points of resemblance in the characters, as well as in the careers, of the two men.

And now, if we were to sum up in one word the impression which he makes upon us, it would be that of his thorough *manliness*. He is every inch a man. There is something manly in his very physique. Tall in person, broad-chested and strong-limbed, he has the figure of an athlete. His head is

large, and the expression of his face one of mingled intelligence and kindliness. He has an open countenance—one in which we can detect no lines of craft and cunning, but which shows a frank and open nature, that scorns guile and trickery and deceit. If there be anything in physiognomy—if we can read the mind in the face—we should say, This is a true, brave, honest man, who would serve his country in any station, legislative or executive, with the same manly courage which he showed in the field.

But there is more in his countenance even than intelligence and simplicity of character. There is another thing which goes with true manliness—great sweetness and gentleness, something which shows under a frame of iron a *heart*, which we do not always find united with sterner qualities. It is a face, in short, which indicates one who is brave as a lion and gentle as a woman. Such is the hero of the hour. We repeat, he is "every inch a man"—big-brained, big-breasted, and big-hearted—a man to love as a companion, and to follow as a leader.

Such is he who, in the full vigor of his manhood—he is not yet fifty—is nominated for President of the United States. Should he be elected to that office, we are sure that he would carry into his new position the same qualities which he has shown hitherto, and that as the head of the Government he would pursue the same straightforward course, and maintain the manly simplicity and integrity of the early days of the Republic.

P A R T V I.

CHARGES AGAINST GENERAL GARFIELD STATED AND EXAMINED.

TO JAMES A. GARFIELD.

Thou, who didst ride on Chickamauga's day
All solitary down the fiery line,
And saw the ranks of battle rusty shine,
Where grand old Thomas held them from dismay,
Regret not now, while meaner pageants play
Their brief campaigns against the best of men !
For those spent balls of scandal pass their way,
And thou shalt see the victory again,
Modest and faithful, though these broken lines
Of party reel, and thine own honor bleeds.
That mole is blind which Garfield undermines,
That dart falls short which hired malice speeds.
That man will stay whose place the State assigns,
And whose high mind a mighty people needs.

G. A. Townsend.

THREE different charges affecting the integrity and honor of General Garfield are made by personal enemies and the baser sort of political opponents, viz., Credit Mobilier, Increase of Salaries, and the De Golyer Pavement. It is proposed to inquire concerning the merits of these matters.

I.

THE CREDIT MOBILIER COMPANY.

THIS charge originated in 1872-'73, and, had it never been made, it is safe to say that little, if anything, would have been heard of the others. Although at one time drawing a considerable share of public attention, it had nearly passed out of the public mind. In the first place, men who carefully looked into the matter saw that General Garfield was in no way compromised; in the second place, another and larger class

of men dismissed the charge on account of the great and growing confidence in the man; and, in the third place, most others dropped it because it no longer produced an appreciable effect. But, naturally, the Chicago nomination has once more brought Credit Mobilier forward, so that it seems necessary to give here a full history of the matter. I shall begin my exposition at the very beginning.

Three Acts of Congress created the Union Pacific Railroad Company, and endowed it with its franchises and responsibilities, viz., the Acts of July 1, 1862, July 2, 1864, and July 3, 1866. These Acts need not be analyzed one by one; suffice it to say that, collectively, they clothed the Company with power to build a railroad and telegraph from Omaha, Nebraska, to the western boundary of Nevada Territory, said railroad to form a part of the line connecting the Missouri and Sacramento Rivers. To enable the Company to execute this purpose, Congress gave it a magnificent endowment: 1. A strip of land, four hundred feet wide, through the public domain; 2. The right of eminent domain to appropriate private lands for depots, etc., where necessary; 3. The free gift of about twelve million acres of United States lands; 4. A loan of United States bonds to the amount of \$27,213,000, payable in thirty years, with interest at six per cent. per annum. The statute of 1862 made this bond-loan a first mortgage upon all the Company's property; but the statute of 1864 accepted a second mortgage in lieu of the

first. Under these statutes the road was built. Let the reader note carefully the dates 1862, 1864, and 1866. Besides, it should be said that the last Act simply fixed the eastern terminus at Omaha, the original charter having left that point practically undetermined. The provisions of law, by which the rights of the Government were to be secured, need not be stated further than to quote this paragraph from the report of the Wilson Investigating Committee, made to the House of Representatives in 1873:

The United States was not a mere creditor, loaning a sum of money upon mortgage. The railroad corporation was not a mere contractor, bound to furnish a specified structure and nothing more. The law created a body politic and corporate, bound, as a trustee, so to manage this great public franchise and endowment that not only the security for the great debt due the United States should not be impaired, but so that there should be ample resources to perform its great public duties in time of commercial disaster and in time of war. (Page 3.)

November 1, 1859, the State of Pennsylvania chartered the Pennsylvania Fiscal Agency, authorizing it to buy and sell securities, and to loan money to railroads and other improvement companies. March 3, 1864, T. O. Durant, Vice-President of the Union Pacific Company, bought this Agency for the purpose of making it a construction company to build the Union Pacific Railroad. The 26th of the same month, its name was changed by law to the "Credit Mobilier of America." Originally, the capital stock was \$2,500,000; but in 1867 it was increased to \$3,750,000. This corporation was perfectly legitimate; Durant had a perfect right to buy it and to use it for building the road; and the road had a perfect right to contract with it. At the same time, it is clear that the Fiscal Agency was bought for an improper purpose, as the following history will show.

If the Credit Mobilier Company were to be used for constructing the road, the natural and straightforward way of proceeding would have been for the railroad company to contract with the Credit Mobilier direct. But there were certain reasons why this simple and easily understood way of pro-

ceeding would not answer. The following was therefore done:

The 16th of August, 1867, Oakes Ames, a member of Congress from Massachusetts, made a contract with the Union Pacific Company, whereby he was to build six hundred and sixty-seven miles of road at a scale of prices that amounted in the aggregate to \$47,925,000. Soon after he transferred this great contract to other hands; not, however, to the hands of the Credit Mobilier as such, but to the hands of seven men, who were called Trustees. They were to hold the contract in trust for such stockholders of the Credit Mobilier Company as should give to the seven irrevocable proxies to vote all Union Pacific Railroad stock that they might at any time hold. October 15, 1867, a triple contract was executed between Ames, the seven trustees, and the Credit Mobilier Company. Ames made over the contract. The Trustees received the contract, were to execute it, and were to hold the profits, if any, in trust for those Credit Mobilier stockholders who are described above. The Credit Mobilier Company, as such, was to advance money with which to begin the work, and was to receive on such advances, in interest and commission, nine and a half per cent.; said nine and a half per cent. to be distributed as dividends, of course, to the stockholders of the corporation. All this was agreed to in October, 1867, in consequence of a perfect understanding existing at the time the Ames contract was made. What is more, the seven Trustees were principal stockholders, and most of them directors, both of the Railroad and the Credit Mobilier Companies. As directors of the railroad they could not contract with themselves as directors of the Mobilier, as trustees, or in any other capacity, to build the road; and this is why the contract was made with Ames, who was not a director in either corporation. The matter then stood thus:

The seven made the contract with Ames; the same seven as trustees received the assignment of the contract from Ames; and as stockholders of the Credit Mobilier Company they were to receive, in company with such of their fellow stockholders in the Mobilier as should be admitted to the ring,

the profits of the contract. Further, they agreed to admit to this division of the profits only those Mobilier stockholders who should deliver to the even irrevocable proxies to vote the stock of the Union Pacific road held by them. This would continue to the Trustees, what they now had, unlimited control of the Union Pacific road. The object of the seven was twofold: first, to secure themselves against personal responsibility; and, second to get the profits likely to accrue. Nor did the seven propose "to let into" the ring more of the Mobilier stock than was necessary to accomplish their purpose. The fewer the shares among which the Ames profits were divided, the larger the sum that would fall to each share. A bushel of salt will be thicker piled on a writing-table than spread over the floor. Accordingly, from this time on there were two kinds of Credit Mobilier stock, that which *was*, and that which *was not*, in the railroad ring. The first could well be worth six hundred or eight hundred per cent., while the other was only worth par. These are the objectionable features of this series of transactions: 1. These railroad stockholders and directors were virtually contracting with themselves; 2. The price that they agreed to pay themselves was exorbitant. The fraud was threefold: 1. Upon certain stockholders of the Credit Mobilier Company; 2. Upon the Union Pacific Railroad property; 3. Upon the Government of the United States. This was the beginning. Things went on swimmingly for a time. The road was built, and millions of profits were divided according to the agreement. But by and by fierce quarrels broke out among the members of the ring, and one of the quarrels brought all the foregoing history, and much more, to the surface. It is clear that, after October 15, 1867, the date of the triple contract, no member of Congress who fully understood the matter could buy Credit Mobilier stock of Mr. Ames or his accomplices without becoming a party to this threefold fraud; nor could he understandingly negotiate for such stock without dishonor. For any man after that time to buy the stock understandingly would be bad enough; for a member of Congress it would be utterly inexcusable. But a member of Congress might

nevertheless buy such stock innocently, or innocently negotiate for it; for the ring were very careful to conceal from the public all their inside transactions. As any one can see, the triple contract could not bear the light of day. We move on now to 1872.

In the Presidential campaign of that year, it was asserted in the newspapers that a number of Representatives and Senators had bought Credit Mobilier stock of Ames. It was said that evidence of this fact had been elicited in a suit pending at Philadelphia between H. S. McComb and Oakes Ames. The testimony got into the newspapers only in fragments; and the public knowledge of the transactions of the Union Pacific Company and the Credit Mobilier Company was so meager that nobody could form an intelligent opinion in the premises. But one thing the public understood perfectly—the charge of bribery was made against these gentlemen. This charge most or all of them hastened to deny. In the list of those alleged to have been corrupted by Ames appeared the name of James A. Garfield. Returning to Washington the 13th or 14th of September, 1872, from Montana, General Garfield saw the charge in the newspapers. He immediately authorized the publication of the following statement, which appeared in the Cincinnati "Gazette" a day or two later:

General Garfield, who has just arrived here from the Indian country, has to-day had the first opportunity of seeing the charges connecting his name with receiving shares of the Credit Mobilier from Oakes Ames. He authorized the statement that he never subscribed for a single share of the stock, and that he never receive or saw a share of it. When the company was first formed George Francis Train, then active in it, came to Washington and exhibited a list of subscribers—of leading capitalists and some members of Congress—to the stock of the company. The subscription was described as a popular one of one thousand dollars each. Train urged General Garfield to subscribe on two occasions, and each time he declined. Subsequently, he was again informed that the list was nearly completed, but that a chance remained for him to subscribe, when he again declined; and to this day he has not subscribed for or received any share of stock or bond of the company.

Here matters rested until the opening of

the ensuing session of Congress. The first day of the session the members of the House against whom the charge had been made demanded a committee of investigation. The House at once adopted the following preamble and resolutions:

Whereas, Accusations have been made in the public press, founded on alleged letters of Oakes Ames, a representative from Massachusetts, and upon the alleged affidavits of Henry S. McComb, a citizen of Wilmington, in the State of Delaware, to the effect that members of this House were bribed by Oakes Ames to perform certain legislative acts for the benefit of the Union Pacific Railroad Company, by presents of stock in the Credit Mobilier of America, or by presents of a valuable character derived therefrom; therefore,

Resolved, That a special committee of five members be appointed by the Speaker *pro tempore*, whose duty it shall be to investigate whether any member of this House was bribed by Oakes Ames, or any other person or corporation, in any matter touching his legislative duty.

Resolved, further, That the committee have the right to employ a stenographer, and that they be empowered to send for persons and papers.

And the Speaker *pro tem.*, Mr. Cox, appointed Messrs. Poland of Vermont, Banks of Massachusetts, McCrary of Iowa, Niblack of Indiana, and Merriek of Maryland, said committee. December 22, 1872, the inquiry began. February 18th following, Judge Poland, the Chairman, made the report to the House. The Committee reported that there had been transactions concerning stock between Oakes Ames and several members of the House, one of whom was Mr. Garfield. They set down the findings in each case under the member's name, and then went on to exonerate them one and all of bribery or corruption. On this point they speak explicitly in these passages:

In his negotiations with these members of Congress, Mr. Ames made no suggestion that he desired to secure their favorable influence in Congress in favor of the Railroad Company, and whenever the question was raised as to whether the ownership of this stock would in any way interfere with or embarrass them in their action as members of Congress, he assured them that it would not.

The Committee, therefore, do not find as to the members of the present House above named,

that they were aware of the object of Mr. Ames, or that they had any other purpose in taking this stock than to make a profitable investment. . . .

The Committee have not been able to find that any of these members of Congress have been affected in their official action in consequence of their interest in Credit Mobilier stock. ("Poland Report," p. viii.)

No exoneration of the original charge could be more emphatic than this. It included Mr. Garfield as well as the other members of the House said to be implicated. Let this point be distinctly noticed: Mr. Garfield was fully exonerated of having known what Ames's intentions were; of having had any other purpose in buying the stock than to make a good investment; of having been influenced as a legislator thereby; or of having "supposed he was guilty of any impropriety, or even indelicacy, in becoming a purchaser of the stock." As to Ames, the Committee found that "he sold to several members of Congress stock of the Credit Mobilier Company at par, when it was worth double that amount or more, with the purpose and intent thereby to influence their votes and decisions upon matters to come before Congress." They then recommended his being expelled from the House. But the Committee distinctly held that the others were not sharers of Ames's guilt, because they were ignorant of his purposes, did not know the value of the stock, and bought it as an ordinary investment. As to the nature of the transaction between Ames and Garfield, the Committee found that:

He agreed with Mr. Ames to take ten shares of Credit Mobilier stock, but did not pay for the same. Mr. Ames received the eighty per cent. dividend in bonds and sold them for ninety-seven per cent, and also received the sixty per cent. cash dividend, which together paid the price of the stock and interest, and left a balance of three hundred and twenty-nine dollars. This sum was paid over to Mr. Garfield by a check on the Sergeant-at-Arms, and Mr. Garfield then understood this sum was the balance of dividends after paying for the stock. Mr. Ames received all the subsequent dividends, and the Committee do not find that, since the payment of the three hundred and twenty-nine dollars, there has been any communication between Mr. Ames and Mr. Garfield on the subject until this investigation began. (Page vii.)

This is the finding of the Committee, professedly based on the testimony before them. As a finding it is worth no more than the testimony on which it rests. Much of that testimony was not printed when the report was submitted to the House, but it has now been seven years before the public, and the public can judge of it as well as the Committee. It is proposed here to analyze it, but first to offer some general remarks. (By the way, the "Poland Report" was never adopted by the House of Representatives.)

1. What is called the public mind of the United States was in a peculiar state in the winter of 1872-'73. Party feeling ran high. The Republican party, then twelve years in the possession of the Government, overwhelming in strength, contained many elements of contention and bitterness within itself. Then that was the period of "Independent" journalism. Newspaper criticisms of public measures and private character were especially slashing and trenchant. The amazing developments that were made concerning the building of the Union Pacific Railroad seemed to point to a corruption that had not been dreamt of, and they scandalized the nation. Men feared that these developments were but harbingers of others to come. In fact, public opinion was disorganized; the bottom fell out of the public mind. The wildest rumors produced the deepest impression. The truth is, the public was in no condition to make up its mind calmly upon the results of any public investigation, even if said investigation had been properly conducted, as this one, it must be said, was not. The investigation had not proceeded far until the doors of the Committee room were thrown open; and in poured a multitude of excited spectators and newspaper men, the most of whom were more intent upon spreading sensational reports than doing justice. The Committee themselves were affected by the prevailing influences. The inquiry was in no sense judicial.

2. As respects our inquiry, the report contains the testimony of but two men, Ames and Garfield. In many points they agree, in some they disagree. But it should be remembered that Ames was the principal agent in bringing about the triple contract

of October, 1867. He had been the prime mover in making the arrangement whereby the Union Pacific Railroad was defrauded, Credit Mobilier stockholders wronged, and the Government lien on the Union Pacific Railroad greatly reduced in value. Besides, he had tried to influence the official action of Representatives and Senators by selling to some, and offering to sell to others, stock for one half its value. In his own words, he had put it "where it would do most good." What is more, his right to the very stock that he said he had sold was questioned. Ames said that he had sold the stock to the persons named. McComb said it properly belonged to him, and brought a suit to recover it. But Durant told another story, saying that this stock properly belonged neither to Ames nor McComb, but to the Company itself; and he said on the stand that he had a summons for Ames in his pocket, and should serve it when he caught Ames in New York. These points are clear: At the time of the investigation Ames had the stock in his possession; he said it properly belonged to Garfield and the others; he was defending a suit against McComb to retain it; and by his own testimony he had himself received the major part of the dividends on it. Such is the record of Ames in Union Pacific Railroad matters. So far as this is a conflict of testimony (not speaking of the conflicts in Ames's own testimony), it is between Ames and Garfield; the latter a man of singular probity up to this transaction, who had all his life inspired all fair men with an unreserved conviction of his sincerity and truth, and who since has continued to make the same impression. Every one must see that Ames went into the investigation hampered and embarrassed by his own transactions; that, in a sense, he was in a false position; while Garfield went into it wholly uncompromised. True, it will be said he was compromised by his own guilt in the transaction, if guilty; but that is the very fact in controversy, and can not be brought forward to impeach him in the beginning. To do that would be proceeding in a circle; it would be ruling out a man's testimony before it was given by assuming that it was false. Once more: Ames's testimony, as we shall soon see, was

singularly confused, wavering, and conflicting; while Garfield's was straightforward, frank, and consistent. It is unfortunate that those who believe Mr. Garfield bought this stock, or affect to believe it, do not rest their belief upon the testimony as now before the world, but upon the impressions made in the excited winter of 1872-'73. Nor must it be forgotten that Ames's testimony was then given out in dribblets through a period of several weeks. By the time a second batch appeared the public had forgotten what the terms of the first batch were. In fact, the public never saw the testimony in a body, and never had an opportunity to compare Ames's different stories. It was indeed published in the "Poland Report," and the material portions of it in Garfield's pamphlet; but not one man in a thousand ever saw either of these documents. If men could be freed from their old impressions, and be brought to examine the testimony afresh, there would be no difficulty—if there be any—save in the cases of those who wish to make difficulty. If a jury of Englishmen or Germans who never had heard of the case could have all the testimony spread before them, if they could be made to know what Ames *was* and Garfield *is*, they could not fail to find with Garfield when he and Ames are in conflict, just as the great majority of fair-minded Americans have done.

We shall now hear what Mr. Ames said, and afterward what Mr. Garfield. All the quotations are from the "Poland Report." December 17, 1872, Ames testified concerning his alleged dealings with members of Congress. In his direct testimony he said concerning Garfield:

I agreed to get ten shares of stock for him, and hold it until he could pay for it. He never did pay for it or receive it. (Page 21.)

This is his cross-examination in full (p. 28):

Q. In reference to Mr. Garfield you say that you agreed to get ten shares for him, and to hold them till he could pay for them, and that he never did pay for them nor receive them? A. Yes, sir.

Q. He never paid any money on that stock nor received any money from it? A. Not on account of it.

Q. He received no dividends? A. No, sir; I

think not. He says he did not. My own recollection is not very clear.

Q. So that, as you understand, Mr. Garfield never parted with any money, nor received any money, on that transaction? A. No, sir. He had some money from me once, some three or four hundred dollars, and called it a loan. He says that that is all he ever received from me, and that he considered it a loan. He never took his stock, and never paid for it.

Q. Did you understand it so? A. Yes; I am willing to so understand it. I do not recollect paying him any dividend, and have forgotten that I paid him any money. (Page 28.)

The next day he testified that:

Messrs. Kelley and Garfield never paid for their stock and never received their dividends. (Page 40.)

Nothing further appears until January 22, 1873, when Ames testified as follows:

Q. In regard to Mr. Garfield, state to the Committee the details of the transactions between you and him in reference to Credit Mobilier stock. A. I got for Mr. Garfield ten shares of the Credit Mobilier stock, for which he paid par and interest.

Q. When did you agree with him for that? A. That agreement was in December, 1867, or January, 1868; about that time, about the time I had these conversations with all of them; it was all about the same time.

Q. State what grew out of it? Q. Mr. Garfield did not pay me any money. I sold the bonds belonging to his \$1,000 of stock at 97, making \$776. In June I received a dividend in cash on his stock of \$600, which left a balance due him of \$329, which I paid him. This is all the transaction between us. I did not deliver him any stock before or since. That is the only transaction, and the only thing. (Page 295.)

Being asked how the \$329 was paid, Ames said:

Paid in money, I believe.

These further questions and answers should also be inserted:

Q. Did you make a statement of this to Mr. Garfield? A. I presume so; I think I did with all of them; that is my impression.

Q. When you paid him this \$329, did you understand it was the balance of his dividend, after paying for his stock. A. I supposed so; I do not know what else he could suppose.

Q. You did not deliver the certificate of stock to him? A. No, sir; he said nothing about that.

Q. Why did he not receive his certificate?
A. I do not know.

Q. Do you remember any conversation between you and him in the adjustment of these accounts? A. I do not. (Pp. 295, 296).

At the same sitting of the Committee, on further cross-examination by Mr. Merrick:

Q. There were dividends of Union Pacific Railroad stock on these ten shares? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did General Garfield ever receive these? A. No, sir; never has received but \$329

Q. And that he has received as his own money? A. I suppose so; it did not belong to me. I should not have given it to him if it had not belonged to him.

Q. You did not understand it to belong to you as a loan; you never called for it, and have never received it back? A. No, sir.

Q. Has there been any conversation between you and him in reference to the Pacific stock he was entitled to? A. No, sir.

Q. Has he ever called for it? A. No, sir.

Q. Have you ever offered it to him? A. No, sir.

Q. Has there been any conversation in relation to it? A. No, sir.

Q. Has there ever been anything said between you and him about rescinding the purchase of the ten shares of Credit Mobilier stock? Has there anything been said to you about its being thrown up, or abandoned, or surrendered? A. No, sir; not until recently.

Q. How recently? A. Since this matter came up.

Q. Since this investigation commenced? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you consider at the commencement of this investigation that you held these other dividends, which you say you did not pay to him, in his behalf? Did you regard yourself as custodian of these dividends for him? A. Yes, sir; he paid for his stock, and is entitled to his dividends.

Q. Will the dividends come to him at any time on his demand? A. Yes, sir; as soon as this suit is settled [*McComb vs. Ames*]

Q. You say that \$329 was paid to him; how was it paid? A. I presume by a check on the Sergeant-at-Arms. I find there are some checks filed without any initials or letters indicating whom they were for. (Pp. 296, 297.)

Ames produced at this sitting what purported to be an original memorandum of his account with Garfield (p. 297), but January 29th he produced another and very different one (p. 459). Under date of January 29th the following questions and answers appear:

Q. Here is another check of the Sergeant-at-Arms, of the same date, June 22, 1868: "Pay O. A., or bearer, \$329, and charge to my account. Oakes Ames." That seems to have been paid by somebody and taken up by the Sergeant-at-Arms. These initials are your own? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know who had the benefit of that check? A. I can not tell you

Q. Do you think you received the money on it yourself? A. I have no idea. I may have drawn the money and handed it to another person. It was paid on that transaction. It may have been paid to Mr. Garfield. There were several sums of that amount.

Q. Have you any memory in reference to this check? A. No, sir; I have no memory as to that particular check. I found these checks in the package which the Sergeant-at-Arms gave me, and I find them on the Sergeant-at-Arms' books.

Q. In regard to Mr. Garfield, do you know whether you gave him a check or paid him the money? A. I think I did not pay him the money. He got it from the Sergeant-at-Arms upon a check

Q. You think the check on which you wrote nothing to indicate the payee must have been for Mr. Garfield? A. Yes, sir; that is my judgment.

Q. And in relation to Mr. Garfield? A. The same in relation to him if it is not borrowed money. I consider that I sold him the stock, and that he holds it.

Q. What the Committee want to learn is, whether, in conversations with any of these gentlemen, they have stated or admitted the matter to be different from what they have testified to before the Committee? A. I hardly know how to answer that question.

Q. Take any one that occurs to you; Mr. Merrick suggests Mr. Garfield? A. Mr. Garfield has been to see me about the matter, and we have talked it over. A part of the time he thinks it was a loan; sometimes he thinks he has repaid me; and then again he is in doubt about it.

Q. You may state whether, in conversation with you, Mr. Garfield claims, as he claimed before us, that the only transaction between you was borrowing \$300? A. No, sir; he did not claim that with me.

Q. State how he does claim it with you; what was said? State all that occurred in conversation between you. A. I can not remember half of it. I have had two or three interviews with Mr. Gar-

field. He wants to put it on the basis of a loan. He states that when he came back from Europe, being in want of funds, he called on me to loan him a sum of money. He thought he had repaid it. I do not know; I can not remember. (Pp. 353-358.)

Under date of February 6th appears the following:

Q. Mr. Garfield has told us how he understood it. What the Committee desire to know of you is your understanding of the matter. A. I supposed it was like all the rest; but when Mr. Garfield says he mistook it for a loan, that he always understood it to be a loan, that I did not make any explanation to him, and did not make any statement to him, I may be mistaken. I am a man of few words, and I may not have made myself understood to him. (Page 461)

And under the same date appears the following:

Q. In testifying in Mr. Garfield's case, you say you may have drawn the money on the check and paid him; is not that answer equally applicable to the case of Mr. Colfax? A. No, sir.

Q. Why not? A. I put Mr. Colfax's initials in the check, while I put no initials in Mr. Garfield's check, and I may have drawn the money myself.

Q. Do you say that if you put any initials before the words "or bearer" into a check, that is evidence that you gave him the check, and that he drew the money on it? A. I am satisfied that I gave him the check any way, because it belonged to him.

Q. Did not Mr. Garfield's check belong to him? A. Mr. Garfield had not paid for his stock. He was entitled to \$329 balance; but Mr. Colfax had paid for his stock, and I had no business with his \$1,200.

The reader is now in position to form his own judgment of Mr. Ames's testimony. Testimony more confused, wavering, and conflicting it would be hard to find. It will be well to call attention to some of the points of confliction:

FIRST OATH.

Q. In reference to Mr. Garfield, you say that he never paid any money on that stock, nor received any money from it? A. Not on account of it.

Q. He received no dividends? A. No, sir,

SECOND OATH.

Q. In regard to Mr. Garfield, state the details of the transactions between you and him? A. I got for Mr. Garfield ten shares of the Credit Mobilier, for which he paid par and interest.

I think not. I do not recollect paying him any dividends.

Q. The \$329 which you paid him was the surplus of earnings on the stock? A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you paid him this \$329, did you understand it was the balance of his dividend? A. I supposed so.

MONEY.

Q. How was that paid? A. Paid in money, I believe.

AMES *pro.*

Q. Did you consider at the beginning of this investigation that you held these other dividends, which you say you did not pay him, in his behalf? Did you regard yourself as custodian of these dividends for him? A. Yes, sir; he paid for his stock and is entitled to his dividends.

CHECK.

Q. You say that \$329 was paid. How was it paid? A. I presume by check.

AMES *con.*

Q. Has there ever been any conversation between you and him in reference to the Pacific stock he was entitled to? A. No, sir.

Q. Have you ever offered it to him? A. No, sir.

Q. Has there ever been any conversation in relation to it? A. No, sir.

Q. You did not deliver the certificate of stock to him? A. No, sir.

DIARY ACCOUNT.

10 shares Credit M....	\$1,000.00
7 mos. 10 days.....	43 36
Total....	\$1,043.36
80 per ct. bd. div. at 97.....	776.00
	\$267.36
Int. to J ^e 20.....	3.64
Total...	\$271.00
1,000 C M.	
1,000 U. P.	

SWORN STATEMENT.

	<i>Dr.</i>
1868. To ten shares stock	
Credit Mobilier of A....	\$1,000
Interest.....	47
June 19. To cash	329
Total.....	\$1,376
	<i>Cr.</i>
1868. By dividend bonds of Union Pacific Railroad, \$1,000 at 80 per cent less 3 per cent.....	776
June 17. By dividend collected for your account.....	600
Total.....	\$1,376

Ames asserted that the account in the right-hand column was made up from that in the left-hand column, but it will be seen that the item of three hundred and twenty-nine dollars cash in the latter—the very element in dispute—does not appear in the former table at all.

It is not necessary to follow Ames further, only it will be well to give his own testimony concerning his memory, and the documentary materials upon which he professed to rely:

Q. You had an envelope the other day, in which you stated Mr. Allison returned his stock, and the post-mark on which shows it was mailed in Dubuque, in March; the year was not given. *A.* No sir.

Q. You were in error, then, in your first statement, in saying that he returned his stock last fall? *A.* Yes, sir, according to the post-mark. *As I told you, I can not remember dates. It may have been three years ago, and still I might have thought it was last fall.*

Q. This statement of Mr. Garfield's account in the memorandum-book is not crossed off, which indicates, does it, that the matter has never been settled or adjusted? *A.* No, sir; it never has.

Q. Can you state whether you have any other entry in relation to Mr. Garfield? *A.* No, sir.

Q. Is your habit, as a matter of business, in conducting various transactions with different persons, to do it without taking any memorandum? *A.* This was my habit. Until within a year or two I have had no bookkeeper, and I used to keep all my own matters in my own way, and very carelessly, I admit.

Q. What was the character of the book in which the memoranda were kept? *A.* It was in a small pocket memorandum, and some of it on slips of paper.

Q. Was this entry upon this page of these various names intended to show the amount you were to pay, or that you had paid; was that made at this date? *A.* I do not know; it was made about that time. I would not have written it on Sunday, it is not very likely. It was made on a blank page. It is simply a list of names.

Q. Were these names put down after you had made the payments or before, do you think? *A.* Before, I think.

Q. You think you made this list before the parties referred to had actually received their checks or received the money? *A.* Yes, sir; that was to show whom I had to pay, and who were entitled to receive the sixty per cent. divi-

dend. It shows whom I had to pay here in Washington.

Q. It says "paid"? *A.* Yes, sir; well, I did pay it.

Q. What I want to know is whether the list was made out before or after payment? *A.* About the same time, I suppose, probably before.

The following from the "Poland Report" is General Garfield's account of his relations to Credit Mobilier (pp. 128-131):

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 14, 1873

J. A. Garfield, a member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of Ohio, having been duly sworn, made the following statement:

The first I ever heard of the Credit Mobilier was some time in 1866 or 1867—I can not fix the date—when George Francis Train called on me and said he was organizing a company to be known as the Credit Mobilier of America, to be formed on the model of the Credit Mobilier of France; that the object of the company was to purchase land and build houses along the line of the Pacific Railroad at points where cities and villages were likely to spring up; that he had no doubt that money thus invested would double or treble itself each year; that subscriptions were limited to one thousand dollars each, and he wished me to subscribe. He showed me a long list of subscribers, among them Mr. Oakes Ames, to whom he referred me for further information concerning the enterprise. I answered that I had not the money to spare, and if I had I would not subscribe without knowing more about the proposed organization. Mr. Train left me, saying he would hold a place open for me, and hoped I would yet conclude to subscribe. The same day I asked Mr. Ames what he thought of the enterprise. He expressed the opinion that the investment would be safe and profitable.

I heard nothing further on the subject for a year or more, and it was almost forgotten, when some time, I should say during the long session of 1868, Mr. Ames spoke of it again; said the company had organized, was doing well, and he thought would soon pay large dividends. He said that some of the stock had been left or was to be left in his hands to sell, and I could take the amount which Mr. Train had offered me by paying the one thousand dollars and the accrued interest. He said if I was not able to pay for it then he would hold it for me till I could pay, or until some of the dividends were payable. I told him I would consider the matter, but would not agree to take any stock until I knew, from an ex-

amination of the charter and the conditions of the subscription, the extent to which I should become pecuniarily liable. He said he was not sure, but thought a stockholder would be liable only for the par value of his stock ; that he had not the stock and papers with him, but would have them after a while.

From the case as presented, I should probably have taken the stock if I had been satisfied in regard to the extent of pecuniary liability. Thus the matter rested for some time, I think until the following year. During the interval I understood that there were dividends due amounting to nearly three times the par value of the stock. But in the mean time I had heard that the company was involved in some controversy with the Pacific Railroad, and that Mr. Ames's right to sell the stock was denied. When I next saw Mr. Ames I told him I had concluded not to take the stock. There the matter ended, so far as I was concerned, and I had no further knowledge of the company's operations until the subject began to be discussed in the newspapers last fall.

Nothing was ever said to me by Mr. Train or Mr. Ames to indicate or imply that the Credit Mobilier was or could be in any way connected with the legislation of Congress for the Pacific Railroad or for any other purpose. Mr. Ames never gave, nor offered to give me any stock or other valuable thing as a gift. I once asked and obtained from him, and afterward repaid to him, a loan of three hundred dollars ; that amount is the only valuable thing I ever received from or delivered to him.

I never owned, received, or agreed to receive any stock of the Credit Mobilier or of the Union Pacific Railroad, nor any dividends or profits arising from either of them.

By the Chairman :

Q. Had this loan you speak of any connection in any way with your conversation in regard to the Credit Mobilier stock ? *A.* No connection in any way except in regard to the time of payment. Mr. Ames stated to me that if I concluded to subscribe for the Credit Mobilier stock, I could allow the loan to remain until the payment on that was adjusted. I never regarded it as connected in any other way with the stock enterprise.

Q. Do you remember the time of that transaction ? *A.* I do not remember it precisely. I should think it was in the session of 1868. I had been to Europe the fall before and was in debt, and borrowed several sums of money at different times and from different persons. This loan from Mr. Ames was not at his instance. I made the

request myself. I think I had asked one or two persons before him for the loan.

Q. Have you any knowledge in reference to any dealings of Mr. Ames with any gentlemen in Congress in reference to the stock of the Credit Mobilier ? *A.* No, sir ; I have not. I had no knowledge that Mr. Ames had ever talked with anybody but myself. It was a subject I gave but little attention to ; in fact, many of the details had almost passed out of my mind until they were called up in the late campaign.

By Mr. Black :

Q. Did you say you refused to take the stock simply because there was a lawsuit about it ? *A.* No ; not exactly that ; I do not remember any other reason which I gave to Mr. Ames than that I did not wish to take stock in anything that would involve controversy. I think I gave him no other reason than that.

Q. When you ascertained the relation that this company had with the Union Pacific Railroad Company, and whence its profits were to be derived, would you have considered that a sufficient reason for declining it irrespective of other considerations ? *A.* It would have been as the case was afterward stated.

Q. At the time you talked with Mr. Ames, before you rejected the proposition, you did not know whence the profits of the company were to be derived ? *A.* I did not. I do not know that Mr. Ames withheld, intentionally, from me any information. I had derived my original knowledge of the organization of the company from Mr. Train. He made quite an elaborate statement of its purposes, and I proceeded in subsequent conversations upon the supposition that the organization was unchanged. I ought to say for myself, as well as for Mr. Ames, that he never said any word to me that indicated the least desire to influence my legislative action in any way. If he had any such purpose, he certainly never said anything to me which would indicate it.

Q. You know now, and have known for a long time, that Mr. Ames was deeply interested in the legislation on this subject ? *A.* I supposed that he was largely interested in the Union Pacific Railroad. I have heard various statements to that effect. I can not say I had any such information of my own knowledge.

Q. You mean that he did not electioneer with you or solicit your vote ? *A.* Certainly not. None of the conversations I ever had with him had any reference to such legislation.

By Mr. Merrick :

Q. Have you any knowledge of any other mem-

ber of Congress being concerned in the Credit Mobilier stock? *A.* No, sir; I have not.

Q. Or any stock in the Union Pacific Railroad? *A.* I have not. I can say to the Committee that I never saw, I believe, in my life a certificate of stock of the Union Pacific Railroad Company, and I never saw any certificate of stock of the Credit Mobilier until Mr. Brooks exhibited one, a few days ago, in the House of Representatives.

Q. Were any dividends ever tendered to you on the stock of the Credit Mobilier upon the supposition that you were to be a subscriber? *A.* No, sir.

Q. This loan of \$300 you have repaid, if I understood you correctly? *A.* Yes, sir.

By Mr. McCrary:

Q. You never examined the charter of the Credit Mobilier to see what were its objects? *A.* No, sir; I never saw it.

Q. If I understood you, you did not know that the Credit Mobilier had any connection with the Union Pacific Railroad Company? *A.* I understood, from the statement of Mr. Train, that its objects were connected with the lands of the Union Pacific Railroad Company, and the development and settlements along that road; but that it had any relation to the Union Pacific Railroad, other than that, I did not know. I think I did hear also that the company was investing some of its earnings in the bonds of the road.

Q. He stated it was for the purpose of purchasing land and building houses? *A.* That was the statement of Mr. Train. I think he said in that connection that he had already been doing something of that kind at Omaha, or was going to do it.

Q. You did not know that the object was to build the Union Pacific Railroad? *A.* No, sir; I did not.

Mr. Garfield was never called before the Committee but once. At the time that the investigation was going on he was carrying the annual appropriations through the House, and could give it no great attention. The last day of the session he said:

I rise to a personal explanation. During the late investigation by the Committee of which the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Poland] was the chairman, I pursued what seemed to be the plain path of duty to keep silence except when I was called upon to testify before the Committee. When testimony was given which appeared to be in conflict with mine, I waited, expecting to be

called again if anything was needed from me in reference to these discrepancies. I was not recalled; and when the Committee submitted their report to the House, a considerable portion of the testimony relating to me had not been printed.

In the discussion which followed here, I was prepared to submit some additional facts and considerations, in case my own conduct came up for consideration in the House, but the whole subject was concluded without any direct reference to myself, and since then the whole time of the House has been occupied with the public business. I now desire to make a single remark on this subject in the hearing of the House. Though the Committee acquitted me of all charges of corruption in action or intent, yet there is in the report a summing up of the facts in relation to me which I respectfully protest is not warranted by the testimony. I say this with the utmost respect for the Committee, and without intending any reflection upon them.

I can not now enter upon the discussion; but I propose, before long, to make a statement to the public, setting forth more fully the grounds of my dissent from the summing up to which I have referred. I will only say now that the testimony which I gave before the Committee is a statement of the facts in the case as I have understood them from the beginning. More than three years ago, on at least two occasions, I stated the case to two personal friends substantially as I stated it before the Committee, and I here add that nothing in my conduct or conversation has at any time been in conflict with my testimony. For the present I desire only to place on record this declaration and notice.

He fulfilled this promise in his "Review of the Transactions of the Credit Mobilier Company," a pamphlet of twenty-eight pages, issued from Washington in 1873. Many thousand copies of this document were circulated. All fair-minded men who have read it admit that it is a complete defense in every particular. No man has ever replied to it. In this "Review" he enlarged upon some points in the testimony thus:

This is the case as I understand it, and as I have always understood it. In reviewing it, after all that has been said and written during the past winter, there are no substantial changes which I could now make, except to render a few points more definite. Few men can be certain that they give with absolute correctness the details of conversations and transactions after a

lapse of five years Subject to this limitation, I have no doubt of the accuracy of my remembrance concerning this transaction.

From this testimony it will be seen that when Mr. Ames offered to sell me the stock in 1867-'68, my only knowledge of the character and objects of the Credit Mobilier Company was obtained from Mr. Train, at least as early as the winter of 1866-'67, long before the company had become a party to the construction contract. It has been said that I am mistaken in thinking it was the Credit Mobilier that Mr. Train offered me in 1866-'67 I think I am not. Mr. Durant, in explaining his connection with the Credit Mobilier Company, says (pp. 169, 170):

"I sent Mr. Train to Philadelphia. We wanted it (the Credit Mobilier) for a stock operation, but we could not agree what was to be done with it. Mr. Train proposed to go on an expanded scale, but I abandoned it. I think Mr. Train got some subscriptions; what they were I do not know."

It has been said that it is absurd to suppose that intelligent men, familiar with public affairs, did not understand all about the relations of the Credit Mobilier Company to the Pacific Railroad Company. It is a sufficient answer to say that, until the present winter, few men, either in or out of Congress, ever understood it; and it was for the interest of those in the management of that arrangement to prevent these facts from being known. This will appear from the testimony of Hon. J. F. Wilson, who purchased ten shares of the stock in 1868. In the spring of 1869 he was called upon professionally to give an opinion as to the right of holders of Pacific Railroad stock to vote their own shares, notwithstanding the proxy they had given to the seven trustees. To enable him to understand the case a copy of the triple contract was placed in his hands. He says (p. 213):

"Down to the time these papers were placed in my hands I knew almost nothing of the organization and details of the Credit Mobilier, or the value of its stock, but then saw that there was abundant ground for future trouble and litigation, and, as one of the results, sold out my interest."

And again (p. 216):

"Q. Do you or did you know, at the time you had this negotiation with Mr. Ames, the value of the Credit Mobilier stock? A. I did not. I wish to state here in regard to that, that it was a very difficult thing to ascertain what was the value of the stock. Those who, as I say in my statement, possessed the secrets of the Credit Mobilier kept them to themselves, and I never was able to get

any definite information as to what the value of the stock was."

When, in the winter of 1867-'68, Mr. Ames proposed to sell me some of the stock, I regarded it as a mere repetition of the offer made by Mr. Train more than a year before. The company was the same, and the amount offered me was the same. Mr. Ames knew it had formerly been offered me, for I had then asked him his opinion of such an investment; and having understood the objects of the company, as stated by Mr. Train, I did not inquire further on that point.

There could not be the slightest impropriety in taking the stock, had the objects of the company been such as Mr. Train represented them to me. The only question upon which I then hesitated was that of the personal pecuniary liability attaching to a subscription; and, to settle that question, I asked to see the charter, and the conditions on which the stock were based. I have no doubt Mr. Ames expected I would subscribe. But more than a year passed without further discussion of the subject. The papers were not brought, and the purchase was never made.

In the winter of 1869-'70 I received the first intimation I ever had of the real nature of the connection between the Credit Mobilier Company and the Pacific Railroad Company, in a private conversation with the Hon. J. S. Black of Pennsylvania. Finding in the course of that conversation that he was familiar with the history of the enterprise, I told him all I knew about the matter, and informed him of the offer that had been made me. He expressed the opinion that the managers of the Credit Mobilier were attempting to defraud the Pacific Railroad Company, and informed me that Mr. Ames was pretending to have sold stock to members of Congress, for the purpose of influencing their action in any legislation that might arise on the subject.

Though I had neither done nor said anything which placed me under any obligation to take the stock, I at once informed Mr. Ames that if he was still holding the offer open to me he need do so no longer, for I would not take the stock. This I did immediately after the conversation with Judge Black, which, according to his own recollection, as well as mine, was early in the winter of 1869-'70.

One circumstance has given rise to a painful conflict of testimony between Mr. Ames and myself. I refer to the loan of three hundred dollars. Among the various criticisms that have been made on this subject, it is said to be a suspicious circumstance that I should have borrowed so small a sum of money from Mr. Ames

about this time. As stated in my testimony, I had just returned from Europe only a few days before the session began, and the expenses of the trip had brought me short of funds. I might have alluded in the same connection to the fact that before going abroad I had obtained money from a banker in New York, turning over to him advanced drafts for several months of my Congressional salary when it should be due. And needing a small sum early in the session, for current expenses, I asked it of Mr. Ames, for the reason that he had volunteered to put me in the way of making what he thought would be a profitable investment. He gave me the money, asking for no receipt, but saying at the time that if I concluded to take the stock, he would settle both matters together. I am not able to fix the exact date of the loan, but it was probably in January, 1868.

This history is straightforward and consistent from first to last. What is more, it is supported by other testimony. Here it should be said, there is much valuable evidence now before the public that never came before the Poland Committee. Dr. J. P. Robison, a well-known citizen and business man of Cleveland, is an intimate friend of General Garfield's, and has been a confidential adviser of the General on business matters for more than twenty years. The following letter speaks for itself:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, May 1, 1873.

DEAR GENERAL: I send you the facts concerning a conversation which I had with you (I think in the spring of 1868) when I was stopping in Washington for some days, as your guest, during the trial of the impeachment of President Johnson. While there, you told me that Mr. Ames had offered you a chance to invest a small amount in a company that was to operate in lands and buildings along the Pacific Railroad, which he (Ames) said would be a good thing. *You asked me what I thought about it as a business proposition; that you had not determined what you would do about it;* and suggested to me to talk with Ames, and form my own judgment, and if I thought well enough of it to advance the money and buy the stock on joint account with you, and let you pay me interest on the one half, I could do so. But I did not think well of the proposition as a business enterprise, and did not talk with Ames on the subject.

After this talk, having at first told you I would give the subject thought, and perhaps talk with

Ames, I told you one evening that I did not think well of the proposition, and had not spoken to Ames on the subject.

Yours truly,

J. P. ROBISON.

HON. J. A. GARFIELD.

The author may with propriety introduce the following letter of his own:

HIRAM, OHIO, February 18, 1873.

DEAR SIR: It may be relevant to the question at issue between yourself and Mr. Oakes Ames, in the Credit Mobilier investigation, for me to state that three or four years ago, in a private conversation, you made a statement to me involving the substance of your testimony before the Poland Committee, as published in the newspapers. The material points of your statement were these:

That you had been spoken to by George Francis Train, who offered you some shares of the Credit Mobilier stock; that you told him that you had no money to invest in stocks; that subsequently you had a conversation in relation to the matter with Mr. Ames; that Ames offered to carry the stock for you until you could pay for it, if you cared to buy it; and that you had told him in that case *perhaps you would take it, but would not agree to do so until you had inquired more fully into the matter.* Such an arrangement as this was made, Ames agreeing to carry the stock until you could decide. In this way the matter stood, as I understood it, at the time of our conversation. *My understanding was distinct that you had not accepted Mr. Ames's proposition,* but that the shares were still held at your option.

You stated, further, that the company was to operate in real property along the line of the Pacific road. Perhaps I should add that this conversation, which I have always remembered very distinctly, took place here in Hiram. I have remembered the conversation the more distinctly from the circumstances that gave rise to it. Having been intimately acquainted with you for twelve or fifteen years, and having had a considerable knowledge of your pecuniary affairs, I asked you how you were getting on, and especially whether you were managing to reduce your debts. In reply you gave me a detailed statement of your affairs, and concluded by saying you had had some stock offered you which, if you bought it, would probably make you some money. You then proceeded to state the case as I have stated it above.

I can not fix the time of this conversation

more definitely than to say it was certainly three, and probably four years ago.

Very truly yours,

B. A. HINSDALE,
President of Hiram College.

Hon. J. A. GARFIELD, *Washington, D. C.*

Once more: In 1872 no man had penetrated more deeply into the Credit Mobilier transactions than the Hon. J. S. Black. He was McComb's counsel, and drew the bill in equity with which the proceedings against Ames began. He investigated the subject as a lawyer, and not as a politician. Judge Black's great ability and learning, as well as his sterling moral character, are household words; and it is well known that he is a life-long Democrat, strongly and even bitterly opposed to the party with which General Garfield has always acted. Judge Black's letters touching this subject have been given on a preceding page, and need not be here repeated.

And finally comes Judge Poland himself, author of the Report, with the following letter sent to the Vermont Republican State Convention:

ST JOHNSBURY, VERMONT, *June 22, 1880.*

To the President of the Convention.

SIR: I was chosen a delegate to the Convention by the Republicans of this town, and hoped to be able to attend, but the unexpected prolongation of the court in this county prevents. I greatly regret my inability to be present. I am not at all anxious to participate in the selection of a State ticket. The Republicans of Vermont can always be safely trusted to nominate good men. I only desire to have an opportunity to express to the Convention and to Republicans everywhere my entire approval of the nominations made at Chicago. Probably no man in Vermont knows General Garfield more intimately than myself. He was in Congress during the whole of my ten years' service, and for eight years we stood together in the House, and ever on terms of friendship and intimacy. Of his eminent ability, power in debate, and untiring devotion to the public service, I need not speak. His long service and leading position in Congress have made him known to all the people of the country who take any interest in public affairs. But our political opponents affect to question his personal integrity and purity of character, and to base their accusations upon the evidence taken

before, and report of, a committee of Congress, of which I was chairman, known as the Credit Mobilier Committee. Now I desire to say to the Convention, and to all who may feel any interest in my opinion of General Garfield, that nothing which appeared before that Committee, or which appears in their report, or any other matter or thing which ever came to my knowledge in regard to him, ever led me to doubt his personal integrity. I believe him to be a thoroughly upright and honest man, and one who would be so under all circumstances and against any temptation. The use that is being made of my name, and of the report of the Committee which was drawn by me, in my opinion makes it proper for me to express my personal judgment as to the character of the man. I ask you to do me the favor to communicate this note to the Convention.

LUKE P. POLAND.

Judge McCrary, one of the members of the Poland Committee, bears this testimony:

KEOKUK, IOWA, *July 17, 1880.*

To the Hon. CHARLES BEARDSLEY, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Upon my return from St. Paul I find your favor of the 16th ult. awaiting me. In reply to your inquiry I say, without qualification, that I regard General Garfield as a man of thorough integrity. I served with him in Congress eight years, and came to know him very intimately. My confidence in his purity of character was strengthened by acquaintance and by familiarity with his daily life. In the Credit Mobilier investigation there appeared a conflict of testimony between General Garfield and Oakes Ames as to the character of their transactions, but the Committee were unanimously of the opinion that even upon Ames's own statement General Garfield had done no wrong, and Democrats and Republicans united in so reporting.

The paragraph in the report which seems to decide the disputed question of fact in favor of Ames was based upon entries in his memorandum book which were offered to corroborate his recollection. It was at most no more than the common case of difference in recollection between parties to a past transaction. Such conflicts are of daily occurrence in our courts, and are decided, as they must be, one way or the other without any reflection upon the veracity of the witness whose recollection is not sustained. With respect, however, to this transaction, I must say that subsequent developments and further consideration of the matter long ago led me to the conclusion that the memorandum of Mr. Ames was very unreliable; and I have for years felt

assured of the correctness of General Garfield's recollection of the facts in dispute.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. McCRARY.

Hon. G. F. Hoar has thus spoken on the same subject:

I was one of the committee who investigated the Credit Mobilier, and wrote the greater part of the report of the committee known as the Wilson Committee. There was nothing in the transaction which in the least gave me reason to distrust General Garfield's absolute integrity. I expressed my opinion of the absolute honor and integrity of General Garfield in this matter years ago. No man, Democrat or Republican, who ever served with Garfield does, I think, doubt that he is absolutely incorruptible. He has been for years on the Committees of Appropriation, and Ways and Means, controlling the expenditure of millions upon millions, and policies that make and unmake great business interests.

So much for the confirmatory evidence of witnesses. But it must be pointed out that General Garfield's account of the matter harmonizes perfectly with his financial status in the period 1868-'73.

The theory that Garfield bought the stock involves these points: that he bought it in the winter of 1868-'69; that it was worth at the time twice its face, and twice the price paid; that it soon rose in value to several times the par of the stock; and that any time from 1869 to 1873 Garfield was entitled to receive several thousand dollars on account of it. In those years General Garfield was living in Hiram, in a small house not worth more than two thousand dollars. His family was large and his family expenses increasing, but his style of living was plain and simple, presenting no contrast to that of his neighbors. He never kept a carriage nor even one horse, and rode to and from the railroad (four miles distant) in the hack, or walked, as the case might be. What is more, his public duties made it necessary that he should live in Washington half of the year. Tired of renting houses, early in 1869 he determined to build a house in the Capital. Accordingly he built the home that he now owns, northeast corner of Thirteenth and I streets. He put into this property such moneys as he had saved from his income; and for the rest bought the lot and

built the house with funds borrowed from an old army friend, Major D. G. Swaim. Finished, the house was covered by mortgages for many thousand dollars, that have been fully paid off only within a year. But all the time that he was building the house, borrowing money and paying interest—at the very time that all his confidential friends knew that his income was quite inadequate to his and his family's reasonable wants—some thousands of dollars that belonged to him were in Ames's hands, awaiting his call! "*Credat Judæus Appella!*" In view of these premises alone, to say nothing about the testimony of witnesses, no conclusions could be sounder than those reached by "The Nation" (numbers 782 and 783):

We are satisfied that Mr. Ames's admitted failure during all that period of four years, either to attempt to deliver the stock, or to pay any subsequent dividends on it, and Mr. Garfield's admitted failure to ask for either stock or dividends, though confessedly in great need of money, give Mr. Garfield's version of the transaction the strongest kind of corroboration; and, taken in connection with what is known of his life and character, would be sufficient, if he were not a Presidential candidate, to clear him in the eyes of all reasonable men of every imputation arising out of it. . . .

We are therefore driven to the conclusion, either that Garfield did not understand that he owned the stock and was entitled to the dividends, or that he is so peculiarly constituted that he, being a poor man, preferred borrowing money to using his own funds.

That Mr. Garfield would submit to be bribed, or that he would submit to negotiate upon such a subject; that when innocently drawn into a questionable transaction he would deny it or prevaricate about it; that he would perjure himself for three hundred and twenty-nine dollars, or any other sum, are propositions that no man who knows him will consider for a moment. No better leave-taking of this subject can be had than his own summing up in the "Review" of 1873:

To sum it up in a word: Out of an unimportant business transaction, the loan of a trifling sum of money as a matter of personal accommodation, and out of an offer never accepted, has arisen this enormous fabric of accusation and suspicion.

If there be a citizen of the United States who is willing to believe that, for three hundred and twenty-nine dollars, I have bartered away my good name, and to falsehood have added perjury, these pages are not addressed to him. If there be one who thinks that any part of my public life has been gauged on so low a level as these charges would place it, I do not address him. I address those who are willing to believe that it is possible for a man to serve the public without personal dishonor. I have endeavored in this review to point out the means by which the managers of a corporation, wearing the garb of honorable industry, have robbed and defrauded a great national enterprise, and attempted, by cunning and deception, for selfish ends, to enlist in its interests those who would have been the first to crush the attempt had their objects been known.

If any of the scheming corporations or corrupt rings that have done so much to disgrace the country by their attempts to control its legislation, have ever found in me a conscious supporter or ally in any dishonorable scheme, they are at full liberty to disclose it. In the discussion of the many grave and difficult questions of public policy which have occupied the thoughts of the nation during the past twelve years, I have borne some part; and I confidently appeal to the public records for a vindication of my conduct.

II.

THE SO-CALLED "SALARY GRAB."

THERE was a time when General Garfield was more criticised on account of his relation to the increase of salaries in the spring of 1873 than on account of either Credit Mobilier or De Golyer. He was freely denounced in certain quarters as a "robber" and a "thief." All of this violent talk subsided long ago; the increase of salaries has nearly passed out of the public mind; but as this old charge is occasionally renovated, it will be well to give a succinct history of the matter here.

Early in the session of 1872-'73 a bill was introduced into the House of Representatives proposing to increase the salaries of certain officers, and, among others, the salaries of members of Congress. This bill was considered from time to time, Mr. Garfield always opposing it. Toward the close of the session, however, by a vote of eighty-one

to sixty-six in the Committee of the Whole on division, and by a vote of one hundred to ninety-seven on the calling of the yeas and nays in the House, the measure was attached to the Legislative Appropriation Bill as an amendment. This bill fills twenty-seven pages of the national statute-book; the offensive clause enacting increased pay to Congressmen is contained in a few lines. The effect of the amendment, as made in the House, was to make a Congressman's salary six thousand five hundred dollars instead of five thousand. It was also retroactive, reaching back to the beginning of that Congress. The Legislative Appropriation Bill, upon which the so-called "grab" had been forced, has been thus analyzed by its author, Mr. Garfield:

I had special charge of the Legislative Appropriation Bill, upon the preparation of which my Committee had spent nearly two weeks of labor before the meeting of Congress. It was the most important of the twelve annual bills. Its provisions reached every part of the machinery of the Government in all the States and Territories of the Union. The amount appropriated by it was one seventh of the total annual expenditures of the Government, exclusive of the interest on the public debt. It contained all the appropriations required by law for the Legislative Departments of the Government; for the public printing and binding; for the President and the officers and employes at the Executive Mansion; for the seven Executive Departments at Washington, and all their bureaus and subdivisions; for the sub-treasuries and public depositaries in fourteen cities of the Union; for all the officers and agents employed in the assessment and collection of the internal revenue; for the governments of the nine Territories and of the District of Columbia; for the mints and the assay offices; for the land offices and the surveys of public lands; and for all the courts, judges, district attorneys, and marshals of the United States. Besides this, during its progress through the two Houses, many provisions had been added to the bill which were considered of vital importance to the public interests. A section had been added in the Senate to force the Pacific Railroad Companies to pay the arrears of interest on the bonds loaned to them by the United States, and to commence refunding the principal.

An investigating committee of the House had unearthed enormous frauds committed by and

against these companies, and, as the result of two months' labor, had framed a bill of several sections to provide for bringing suits in the courts to recover the vast sums of which the road and Government had been plundered, and to prevent further spoliation. That bill had also been made a part of the Appropriation Bill.

While the bill was first passing through the House, repeated efforts were made to increase the salaries of different officers of the Government; in every instance I resisted these efforts, and but little increase was made until forty-eight hours before the Congress expired, when the House loaded upon this bill an amendment increasing the salaries of the President, Vice-President, Judges of the Supreme Court, and members of Congress, including those of the Forty-second Congress

From the House, the bill, as amended, went to the Senate. When the Senate was through with it, there were sixty-three points of difference between the two Houses. The Senate favored the increase of salaries by majorities even more decided than those of the House. Moreover, while the House was content with six thousand five hundred dollars without mileage, the Senate was in favor of seven thousand five hundred dollars with mileage. As is usual in such cases, the bill, with its various amendments, was referred to a Conference Committee. As Mr. Garfield himself said at a later day, the battle against the salary clause was fought and lost before the Appropriation Bill went to the Conference Committee. The Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate both recognized the fact in appointing their respective Committees of Conference. Messrs. Morrill, Carpenter, and Bayard, Senators, were all in favor of the increase; were Messrs. Butler and Randall, of the House Committee. Mr. Garfield stood alone in the Committee in opposition. He opposed the measure in Committee, as he had done in the House, but was overborne five to one. By that majority the Congressional salary was fixed at seven thousand five hundred dollars per year. However, in deference to him, the Committee agreed to the following: "*Provided*, That in settling the pay and allowances of members of the Forty-second Congress, all mileage shall be deducted, and no

allowances shall be made for expenses of travel."

The effect of this provision was to save to the Treasury about four hundred thousand dollars. In its present shape, as an amendment to this great appropriation bill, the question was a very different one from what it had been when the salary measure stood by itself on its own merits. It was clear that it must now stand or fall with the bill itself. Without reference to his own action, it would be reported back favorably to the two Houses. The question was, "Shall I, Mr. Garfield, acquiesce with the majorities of the two Houses, or shall I continue my opposition?" Plainly, the majorities were such that he could defeat the measure, if at all, only by a factious opposition that would defeat the bill itself. Only a day or two of the session remained; three of the great appropriation bills were yet to be disposed of; and the defeat of the Legislative Bill would involve an extra session of Congress. The Government could not be carried on beyond the close of the fiscal year unless, in some shape, this bill should pass. After carefully considering all the facts, he concluded that it was his duty to concur with his fellow committeemen, to sign the report, and to carry it to the House of Representatives. If he did this, as Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, he would retain control of the bill; if not, it would fall into the hands of Mr. Butler or Mr. Randall, neither of whom belonged to the Appropriations Committee, or had had any considerable share in perfecting the bill. In presenting the Conference Report to the House he said: "I was opposed to the increase in conference, as I have been opposed to it in the discussion and in my votes here; but my associate conferees were in favor of the Senate amendment, and I was compelled to choose between signing the report and running the risk of bringing on an extra session of Congress. I have signed the report, and I present it as it is, and ask the House to act on it in accordance with their best judgment." Of course, his final vote was in accordance with his decision in the Committee; he could not consistently sign the report, and then vote against the thing reported.

General Garfield's action on the salary question subjected him to much criticism in his own district. September 19, 1874, he discussed the subject, in a speech delivered at Warren, in a manner so thorough, so temperate, and so honest, that it will be well to reproduce the material parts of his discussion here:

Now, fellow citizens, I presume you will agree that you can wrong even the devil himself, and that it is not right or manly to lie even about Satan. I take it for granted that we are far enough past the passion of that period to talk plainly and coolly about the increase of salaries.

Now, in the first place, I say to-night what I have said all through this tempest, that for a Congress to increase its own pay and make it retroactive is not theft, is not robbery, and you do injustice to the truth when you call it so. There is ground enough in which to denounce it without straining the truth. Now, if Congress can not fix its own salary, who can? The Constitution of your country says in unmistakable words, that "Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation to be ascertained by law and paid out of the National Treasury." Nobody makes the law but Congress. It was a very delicate business in the beginning for our fathers to make a law paying themselves money. They understood it so, and when they sent the Constitution out to the several States, the question was raised whether it would not be better to put a curb upon Congress in reference to their own pay, and from several of the States suggestions were sent in. When the First Congress met, James Madison offered seventeen amendments to the Constitution, and finally Congress voted to send twelve of the proposed amendments to the country. One of them was this: "No law varying the compensation of the Senators and Representatives in Congress shall take effect until an election has intervened." In other words, the First Congress proposed that an amendment should be made to the new Constitution that no Congress could raise its own pay and make it retroactive. That was sent to the States for their ratification. The States adopted ten of those amendments. Two they rejected, and this was one of the two. They said it should not be in the Constitution. The reason given for its rejection by one of the wisest men of that time was this. He said: "If we adopt it, this may happen: one party will go into power in a new Congress, but, just before the old Congress expires, the defeated party may pass a law reducing the pay of Congress to ten cents

a day. It will never do thus to put one Congress into the power of another; it would be an engine of wrong and injustice." For this reason our fathers refused to put into the Constitution a clause that would prevent back pay. Now, it will not do to say that a provision that has been deliberately rejected from the Constitution is virtually there, and it will not do to say that it is just to call it theft and robbery for a Congress to do what it has plainly the constitutional right to do. I use the word *right* in its legal sense. Now, take another step. I hold in my hand here a record of all the changes of pay that have been made since this Government was founded, and in every case—I am not arguing now that it is right at all, I am only giving you a history of it—in every single instance when Congress has raised its pay, it has raised it to take effect from the first day of the session of Congress. Six times Congress has increased its own pay, and every time it made the pay retroactive. I say again I am not arguing that this was right and proper. I am only arguing that it was lawful and constitutional to do it. In 1856 the pay was raised, and was made retroactive for a year and four months, and the member of Congress from this district threw the casting vote that made it a law. That act raised the pay by a larger per cent than the act of last Congress. Joshua R. Giddings was the one hundredth man that voted ay; ninety-nine voted no. Joshua R. Giddings's vote the other way would have turned the score against it. That vote gave back pay for a year and four months. That vote gave Congress nine months' back pay for a time when members would not have been entitled to anything whatever, because under the old law they were paid only during the session. What did this district do? Did it call him a thief and a robber? A few weeks after that vote this district elected him to Congress for the tenth time. Have the ethics of the world changed since 1856? Would I be a thief and a robber in 1873 if I had done what my predecessor did in 1856? In 1866 the pay was raised. That time it was put in an appropriation bill, a very important appropriation bill—a bill giving bounties to soldiers. It passed through the Senate, and came to the House. There was a disagreement about it. Senator Sherman, of Ohio, had charge of the bill in the Senate, and voted against the increase of pay every time it came up on its own merits. But he was outvoted. Finally, it went to a committee of conference. The conference report between the two Houses was made in favor of the bill. Mr. Sherman brought in the report, saying when he brought it in that he had been opposed

to the increase of pay, but the Senate had overruled him. He voted for the Conference Report, voted for the final passage of the bill. That bill gave back pay for a year and five months. Was John Sherman denounced as a thief and robber for that? Was Benjamin F. Wade called a thief and a robber?

At that time I was not chairman of the Committee, and had no other responsibility than that of an individual Representative. I voted against the increase of salary then at all stages. I voted against the Conference Report, but it passed through the House on a final vote by just one majority. I do not remember that anybody ever praised me particularly for voting against that report, and I never heard anybody blame John Sherman for voting for it.

Now, in 1873 the conditions were exactly the reverse. I was chairman of the Committee that had charge of the great Appropriation Bill. There was put upon that bill against my earnest protest a proposition to increase salaries. I take it there is no one here who will deny that I worked as earnestly as I could to prevent the putting of that increase upon the bill. I did not work against it because it was a theft or a robbery to put it on there; I worked against it because I thought it was indecent, unbecoming, and in the highest degree unwise and injudicious to increase the salaries at that time: first, because they had been increased in 1866, and, in proportion to other salaries, Congressmen were paid enough—paid more in proportion than most other officials were paid; second, the glory of the Congress had been that it was bringing down the expenditures of the Government from the highest level of war to the lowest level of peace; and if we raised our own salary, unless the raise had been made before, it would be the keynote on which the whole tune of extravagance would be sung. I believed, too, that it would seriously injure the Republican party, and on that score I thought we ought to resist it. I did all in my power to prevent that provision being added to the bill. I voted against it eighteen times. I spoke against it. But by a very large vote in the House, and a still larger vote in the Senate, the salary clause was put upon the bill. I was captain of the ship, and this objectionable freight had been put upon my deck. I had tried to keep it off. What should I do? Burn the ship? Sink her? Or, having washed my hands of the responsibility for that part of her cargo I had tried to keep off, navigate her into port, and let those who had put this freight on be responsible for it? Using the figure, that

was the course I thought it my duty to adopt. Now, on that matter I might have made an error of judgment. I believed then and now that if it had been in my power to kill this bill, and had thus brought on an extra session—I believe to-day, I say, had I been able to do that, I should have been the worst-blamed man in the United States. Why? During the long months of the extra session which would have followed, with the evils which the country would have felt, and by having its business disturbed by Congress and the uncertainties of the result, you would have said: "All this has come about because we did not have a man at the head of the Committee on Appropriations with nerve enough and force enough to carry his bill through by the end of the session. The next time we have a Congress we had better see if we can not get a man who will get his bills through." Suppose I had answered: "There was that salary increase." "That won't do. You had shown your hand on the salary question; you had protested against it; and you had done your duty." Then they would have said there were six or seven sections in the bill empowering the United States to bring the railroads before the courts and make them account for their extravagance. They would have said: "We have lost all that by the loss of this bill." And I would have been charged with acting in the interest of railroad corporations, and fighting to kill the bill for that reason. But be that as it may, fellow citizens, I considered the two alternatives as well as I could. I believed it would rouse a storm of indignation and ill-feeling throughout the country if that increase of salary passed. I believed it would result in greater evils if the whole failed, and an extra session came on. For a little while I was tempted to do what would rather be pleasing than what would be best in the long run. I believe that it required more courage to vote as I voted than it would to have voted the other way; but I resolved to do what seemed to me right in the case, let the consequences be what they would. I may have made a mistake in judgment; I blame no one for thinking so, but I did what I thought was the least bad of two courses. My subsequent conduct was consistent with my action on the bill.

I did not myself parade the fact, but more than a year ago the New York "World" published a list stating, in chronological order, the Senators and Representatives who covered their back pay into the Treasury. My name was first on the list.

I appeal to the sense of justice of this people

whether they will tolerate this sort of political warfare. It has been proved again and again that I never drew back pay, never saw a dollar of it, and took no action in reference to it except to sign an order on the Sergeant-at-Arms to cover it into the general Treasury, and this was done before the Convention at Warren. I say more: Some of these men who have been so long publishing me have known these facts for many months. During the stormy times of the salary excitement a citizen of this county wrote a letter to a prominent official in the Treasury of the United States, wanting to know whether Mr. Garfield drew his pay or not, and received a very full and circumstantial reply, stating the facts. That letter is in this town, I suppose, to-day, but those who have had possession of it have been careful never to show it. I have a copy of it here, and if these men continue lying I will print it one of these days. [Cries of "Let us have that letter read now, General Garfield"] I will not give the name of the party—the name I have not—to whom it is addressed.

[The audience here absolutely insisted on having the letter read, some demanding the name, and all positively refusing to allow the speaker to proceed without reading the letter, in justice to himself and for the information of the audience.]

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, {
June 9, 1873. }

"DEAR SIR: Your letter, written early in May, was forwarded to me at Youngstown, where it could not be answered for want of accurate data. When about to return to Washington, I searched for that letter, but could not find it. My recollection of its contents is, that you inquired as to the repayment into the Treasury by General Garfield of the additional compensation due him, as a member of the Forty-second Congress, under the provisions of the General Appropriation Act of March 3, 1873.

"The additional compensation due General Garfield was drawn by Mr. Ordway, Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives, and by him paid into the Treasury as a miscellaneous revenue receipt. The money was drawn by Mr. Ordway on the order of General Garfield. The practice of the Sergeant-at-Arms is to take receipts from members in blank, in anticipation of the dates at which they are to become due, and to pay their checks on him by drawing the money from the Treasury on those receipts. In this way he is in a measure the banker of the members. General Garfield had signed such receipts month after month at the beginning of the month, one of which was filled up by Mr. Ord-

way and presented to the Treasury. At that time I believe General Garfield was out of the city, but I happened to know that as soon as the 22d day of March this written order was delivered to Mr. Ordway—if he had not drawn any money from the Treasury on his account, to close the account without drawing it; and if he had drawn it, to return it. Mr. Ordway then informed him that it was necessary for him to sign a special order on the Treasurer if he wished it drawn out and covered in; otherwise Mr. Garfield could draw it any time within two years; whereupon Mr. Garfield drew an order for \$4,548, payable to the order of Mr. Ordway, to be by him covered into the Treasury. This was presented to the Treasurer, and the money turned over from the appropriation account to the general account, so that no portion of it ever left the Treasury at all. It was simply a transfer from the appropriation account to the general funds of the Treasury. Very respectfully,

"ROBERT N. TAYLER."

It should be added to this statement, that immediately after the adjournment of Congress Mr. Garfield went to Cleveland to try a case in the United States District Court, in which he had been employed as counsel some time before. On his return to Washington, he drew an order covering the money due him under the law into the Treasury. What is more, he was one of the first of all the members of Congress to do so. Besides, when the proposition to repeal the salary clause was before Congress at the next session, he gave it his earnest support. In his speech in reply to Hon. A. H. Stephens, he touched one phase of the question thus:

One of the brightest and greatest of men I know in this nation, a man who, perhaps, has done as much for its intellectual life as any other, told me not many months ago that he had made it the rule of his life to abandon any intellectual pursuit the moment it became commercially valuable; that others would utilize what he had discovered; that his field of work was above the line of commercial values, and when he brought down the great truths of science from the upper heights to the level of commercial values, a thousand hands would be ready to take them, and make them valuable in the markets of the world.

[A voice—Who was he?]

Mr. Garfield—It was Agassiz. He entered upon his great career, not for the salary it gave him, for that was meager compared with the pay

of those in the lower walks of life; but he followed the promptings of his great nature, and worked for the love of truth and the instruction of mankind. Something of this spirit has pervaded the lives of the great men who did so much to build up and maintain our republican institutions. And this spirit is, in my judgment, higher and worthier than that which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Stephens] has described. To come immediately to the question before us, I join in no criminations against those who used their right to vote and act differently from myself on this subject. But when the public says to me, and to those associated with me, that we have, under constitutional law, given ourselves more pay than that public is willing to grant us, it would be indelicate and indecent in us on such a question to resist that public opinion.

The following letter explains itself:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, }
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, June 22, 1880. }

H. DUSEY, Esq., *East Des Moines, Iowa.*

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 17th inst., asking to be informed on what date the Hon. James A. Garfield paid into the Treasury his back pay, and how the Treasury books show this transaction, I have to inform you it appears from the records of this office that the sum of \$4,548 was deposited to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, in the name of James A. Garfield, on account of "retroactive increase of salary," on the 22d day of April, 1873; and that this amount was covered into the Treasury by miscellaneous covering warrant No. 704, second quarter, 1873, and can not be withdrawn except by act of Congress.

Very respectfully,

J. K. UPRON, Assistant Secretary.

III.

DE GOLYER.

THE following article from "The Nation" (No. 788) is so thorough and impartial in its treatment of this subject, that I can not do better than to give it entire. This journal, it should be remarked, is so perpendicular in its independence as sometimes to lean backward. That "The Nation" criticises General Garfield on the score of propriety gives its judgment additional force on the main point:

The accusation regarding the De Golyer contract against General Garfield is made in various

ways. It includes the charge that, when Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and knowing that appropriations for such improvements as this De Golyer contract covered would be pressed upon the Committee, he accepted a fee of five thousand dollars, ostensibly for legal services for the purpose of procuring the contract from the Board of Public Works, but really for his influence as Chairman of the Committee; that he thus made himself the advocate of a contract which was bad in itself, and thus also took a bribe to affect his action in his Committee in favor of this and like contracts; or, if it was not on his part the taking of a bribe, that he must have known that the motive with which the money was paid him was to secure his influence as such chairman in favor of the appropriations to pay for this and like contracts. Such is the substance of this accusation in its various forms and phases.

In order that the public may properly judge of it, it is necessary to know the following facts, which can easily be verified by reference to the public laws, the records of the District of Columbia, and the testimony that has been taken by two investigating committees of Congress.

February 21, 1871, Congress passed an act creating a government for the District of Columbia, just such a government in general as is organized in the territories by Congressional action. This act provided for a Governor, in whom was vested "executive power and authority"; a Legislative Assembly, in which was vested "legislative power and authority"; a Board of Public Works, to which was given control of the streets, avenues, and sewers, and all other works that the Legislative Assembly might intrust to it. It also provided that the Board of Public Works should have "no power to make contracts to bind said District to the payment of any sums of money except in pursuance of appropriations made by law, and not until such appropriations shall have been made." This has reference wholly to appropriations made by the Legislative Assembly. The government having been thus created, and with this restriction on the Board of Public Works, on the 20th day of June, 1871, the Board submitted to the Legislative Assembly a plan for the improvement of the cities of Washington and Georgetown, and the roads outside these cities, embracing nearly all the streets and avenues and roads, and in the submission of this plan estimated the entire cost to be \$4,358,598, recommended the adoption of this plan, and submitted to the Legislative Assembly a bill to provide "the necessary means for the execution of the work."

On the 10th day of July, 1871, the Legislative

Assembly passed this act, appropriating \$4,000,000 to do the work referred to in the plan, or, to use the language of the act, "to be used and expended, . . . as fully as may be practicable and consistent with the public interest, in conformity with the plan of improvement submitted to the said Legislature by the Board of Public Works of said District in its communication bearing date June 20, 1871"; and in order to procure the money thus appropriated, it was provided in this act that bonds of the District to the amount of \$4,000,000 should be issued, and also provided for levying a tax on the property in the District to pay the interest on these bonds, and to provide for the gradual reduction of the principal. It was further provided that the Board should "in no case enter into a contract for any work or improvement the cost of which shall exceed the amount estimated therefor in its aforesaid plan, less twenty per cent. of said estimates." May 8, 1872, Congress approved the act of the Legislative Assembly above alluded to, and in connection with it enacted that the debt of the District, including the debts of the late corporations of Washington and Georgetown, "shall at no time exceed the sum of \$10,000,000, unless an increase over the said amount shall have been previously authorized by Act of Congress." At the time the new government came into existence the debt of the District, including the corporations of Washington and Georgetown, was in the aggregate \$5,520,626.02, so that the \$4,000,000 loan brought the amount of indebtedness up to within \$479,373.98 of the limit that was fixed by the Act of Congress above alluded to.

From the foregoing the following facts will be observed:

1st. That Congress had turned over the control of the streets, avenues, and roads to the government of the District of Columbia.

2d. That that government adopted a plan of improvements.

3d. That that government provided the money with which to pay for those improvements.

4th. That the Board of Public Works was prohibited by Congress from making contracts before appropriations were made, and prohibited from contracting in excess of appropriations.

5th. That the Legislative Assembly restricted the Board in making contracts to 80 per cent. of the \$4,000,000 loan.

6th. That Congress had fixed a limit to the entire indebtedness, which limit the \$4,000,000 almost reached.

7th. That the money to pay for this work was not to come through appropriations by Congress,

but was to be derived by taxation of the property in the District imposed by the Legislative Assembly.

In September, 1871, the Board of Public Works, instead of adopting the policy of letting contracts to do the contemplated work to the lowest bidder, fixed a scale of prices that would be paid for various kinds of work, that is to say: a specific price for grading per cubic yard, a specific price per square yard for concrete pavement, for wood pavement, for stone pavement, and so on; so that when they determined to lay a particular kind of pavement on a certain street or avenue, whether of wood, stone, or concrete, the price was already fixed, and the open question was which kind of wood or stone or concrete should be laid; and hence there was a struggle before the Board by the owners of the various patents for pavements to have their respective patents adopted for use, and this brought in question the merits of the respective patents. It made no difference whatever as to the cost, whether one patent was used or another of the class of wooden or concrete pavements; the price was precisely the same.

De Golyer and McClellan had a patented wooden pavement. Others had patents for wooden pavements, and between these there were contests as to merit. There was also the question of merit as between wooden and concrete pavements. De Golyer and McClellan employed Mr. Parsons as their attorney to procure the adoption of their pavement, by showing to the Board its superiority over others. This was the *only* question to be considered—the question of price having been settled months before, by the adoption of a schedule of prices. The hearing before the Board as to the merits of these various patents was about to be had, and Mr. Parsons was called away from Washington. He asked General Garfield to take his place as attorney to argue the merits of the De Golyer patent. As above shown, there was nothing else to argue. General Garfield appears never to have seen De Golyer or McClellan or anybody else in relation to this employment, excepting Mr. Parsons, and at the latter's solicitation he examined the various patents and made his presentation of the case to the Board, was paid a fee for it, and there his relations to the subject entirely ended. He had nothing whatever to do with making or shaping the contract under which the pavement was laid. Now, the money having already been provided to pay for all the improvements that the Board was authorized to make, it seems impossible that it could have been contemplated by General Garfield or any one else

that appropriations would be asked from Congress with which to pay for any portion of them.

In order to make good the accusation against General Garfield the following must be assumed : 1. That the Board contemplated at that early period of its career violating the law prohibiting the making of contracts in excess of and prior to appropriations. 2. That it then contemplated violating the law restricting it to eighty per cent. of the four million dollars loan. 3. That it then contemplated the violation of the law limiting the indebtedness of the District to ten millions of dollars. 4. That General Garfield had knowledge that the Board so contemplated.

In the absence of these assumptions the case is in brief this: The money had, long before General Garfield's employment, been provided by the District government to pay for the improvements; the prices to be paid had been established; no appropriation by Congress could have been in contemplation; the question, and the only question, was whether this or that kind of pavement should be used, and General Garfield as an attorney argued in favor of the De Golyer patent.

The impression has entered the public mind that the De Golyer patent is worthless, but this is wholly erroneous. No one familiar with the subject has questioned that it was at least as good as any other process of laying wooden pavements, and no question of that kind has ever been made before the Committee or elsewhere. The impression, too, possibly prevails that there was something fraudulent in the contract as to prices, etc. But this is wholly without foundation. The Board having adopted a schedule of prices long before, when the decision was made to lay this pavement to any extent, it was at the price already fixed. If any other pavement of wood had been adopted in preference to this, the price would have been the same; so that the use of this pavement involved no more expenditure than if any other had been adopted.

It may be asked, Why, then, all the criticism that has appeared in regard to this De Golyer and McClellan contract? The answer is this: It is maintained by those who were assailing the Board of Public Works that the prices paid for work were unreasonable and excessive, and to show this the proof was presented to the Committee that, for a quantity of work which would amount to about seven hundred thousand dollars, the parties were willing to pay and agreed to pay ninety-seven thousand dollars in commissions and attorneys' fees; consequently, it was argued, the Board in fixing the schedule of prices had fixed them too high, and thereby had violated their duty. But

these prices would have been paid if any other wooden pavement had been used, and were paid to every other contractor where wooden pavement was used; and every other contract for wooden pavement was and is amenable to precisely the same criticism. The De Golyer contract is no more fraudulent than every other that was made to lay wooden pavements. To establish the same fact—viz., that the Board had fixed its schedule of prices too high, and thereby had unnecessarily burdened the taxpayers—proof was adduced that it was quite common to let a contract to lay a pavement, and the contractor would at once sublet at a rate twenty-five cents less per square yard, giving a profit or bonus of twenty-five cents per square yard for doing nothing. The De Golyer and McClellan contract differed in no respect from all others, and it only became conspicuous because it showed the amount that the Board was paying by its schedule of prices in excess of what should have been paid.

The sum and substance of the whole matter, as regards General Garfield, then, is, that at the request of a friend of his, the attorney for the De Golyer and McClellan Paving Company, he examined the evidence in favor of some forty kinds of pavement, prepared the required brief, which was intended for the Board of Public Works, made known to Mr. Shepherd, then President of the Board, his favorable opinions, and expressed the hope that he would give these Western men a chance. No price was agreed upon for the service, but Mr. Parsons paid him five thousand dollars, saying that he had received a large fee and would share it with him. The disproportion of the fee to the work performed may be attributed to the large interests involved and to the friendly intervention of Mr. Parsons. But the case, nevertheless, exemplifies one of the gross abuses prevalent in public life which the friends of good government can have no difficulty in condemning. We refer to the practice of seeking and giving weight to the opinions of public men on subjects of which they know no more than any one else, and in legal cases paying fees in proportion to their influence. We should have liked it much better if General Garfield had told his friend that there were scores of people much better qualified to form a reliable opinion of pavements; that his official position would give a factitious importance to his opinion which he did not wish it to have; and that the services of the best experts should be sought for rather than his own. We do not think, therefore, that the motives of Mr. Parsons and his clients in employing Mr. Garfield are above suspicion. It is not improbable

that they sought in so doing something more than his services as counsel, but we can discover no trace of anything worse on his part than indiscretion. With this we think he may be fairly charged, and although the character of the Board of Public Works was not as well known then as it was afterward, there must have been enough known about it to suggest to a prudent public man the impropriety of taking a hand in influencing it in any matter, and especially in a matter in which he had no claim to be considered an expert. General Garfield has been severely assailed, too, because he made no formal argument before the Board as a whole, and the inference has been drawn from this that he knew he did not render full service for his fee. But an oral argument would hardly have added anything to the value of his brief; and having made the brief, we think he was fully justified by forensic custom in thinking that he had done enough. Let us say finally that in judging him on the charge of indiscretion, it is not fair to judge his conduct in 1871 with the light of 1880. There is not one of us whose views about discretion touching the relations between politics and money have not been greatly clarified by the events of the past nine years.

It should be added to this exposition of the subject, that District-of-Columbia affairs were several times overhauled by investigating committees. One of these committees had for its chairman Hon. A. G. Thurman, Democratic Senator from Ohio. No one of these committees ever found anything against James A. Garfield. Hon. J. M. Wilson of Indiana, long a member of the House of Representatives, himself a member of a District Investigating Committee, as long

ago as 1874 bore the following testimony to General Garfield's entire freedom from censure in the premises:

CONNEERSVILLE, IND., August 1, 1874.

The Hon. George W. Steele.

DEAR SIR: To the request for information as to whether or not the action of General Garfield, in connection with the affairs of the District of Columbia, was the subject of condemnation by the Committee that recently had those affairs under consideration, I answer that it was not; nor was there, in my opinion, any evidence that would have warranted any unfavorable criticism upon his conduct. The facts disclosed by the evidence, so far as he is concerned, are briefly these: The Board of Public Works was considering the question as to the kind of pavements that should be laid. There was a contest as to the respective merits of various wooden pavements. Mr. Parsons represented, as attorney, the De Golyer and McClellan patent, and, being called away from Washington about the time the hearing was to be had before the Board of Public Works on this subject, procured General Garfield to appear before the Board in his stead and argue the merits of this patent. This he did, and this was the whole of his connection in the matter. It was not a question as to the kind of contract that should be made, but as to whether this particular kind of pavement should be laid. The criticism of the Committee was not upon the *pavement* in favor of which General Garfield argued, but was upon the *contract* made with reference to it; and there was no evidence which would warrant the conclusion that he had anything to do with the latter.

Very respectfully, etc.,

J. M. WILSON.

APPENDIX.

I.

REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC PLATFORMS

FROM 1856 TO 1880 INCLUSIVE.

REPUBLICAN, PHILADELPHIA, JUNE, 1856.

THIS Convention of Delegates, assembled in pursuance of a call addressed to the people of the United States, without regard to past political differences or divisions, who are opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, to the policy of the present Administration, to the extension of slavery into free territory, in favor of admitting Kansas as a free State, of restoring the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson, and who purpose to unite in presenting candidates for the offices of President and Vice-President, do resolve as follows:

1. That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions, and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the union of the States, shall be preserved; that, with our republican fathers, we hold it to be a self-evident truth that all men are endowed with the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that the primary object and ulterior design of our Federal Government were to secure these rights to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction; that, as our republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing slavery in the United States by positive legislation prohibiting its existence or extension therein; that we deny the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legis-

lature, of any individual or association of individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States while the present Constitution shall be maintained.

2. That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of this power it is both the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery.

3. That, while the Constitution of the United States was ordained and established by the people "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty," and contains ample provisions for the protection of the life, liberty, and property of every citizen, the dearest constitutional rights of the people of Kansas have been fraudulently and violently taken from them; their territory has been invaded by an armed force; spurious and pretended legislative, judicial, and executive officers have been set over them, by whose usurped authority, sustained by the military power of the Government, tyrannical and unconstitutional laws have been enacted and enforced; the right of the people to keep and bear arms has been infringed; test-oaths of an extraordinary and entangling nature have been imposed as a condition of exercising the right of suffrage and holding office; the right of an accused person to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury has been denied; the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, has been violated; they have been deprived of life, liberty, and property without due

process of law; that the freedom of speech and of the press has been abridged; the right to choose their representatives has been made of no effect; murders, robberies, and arsons have been instigated and encouraged, and the offenders have been allowed to go unpunished; that all these things have been done with the knowledge, sanction, and procurement of the present Administration, and that for this high crime against the Constitution, the Union, and humanity, we arraign the Administration, the President, his advisers, agents, supporters, apologists, and accessories either *before* or *after* the fact, before the country and before the world; and that it is our fixed purpose to bring the actual perpetrators of these atrocious outrages and their accomplices to a sure and condign punishment hereafter

4. That Kansas should be immediately admitted as a State of the Union, with her present free Constitution, as at once the most effectual way of securing to her citizens the enjoyment of the rights and privileges to which they are entitled, and of ending the civil strife now raging in her territory.

5. That the highwayman's plea that "might makes right," embodied in the Ostend Circular, was in every respect unworthy of American diplomacy, and would bring shame and dishonor upon any Government or people that gave it their sanction.

6. That a railroad to the Pacific Ocean by the most central and practicable route is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country, and that the Federal Government ought to render immediate and efficient aid in its construction; and, as an auxiliary thereto, to the immediate construction of an emigrant route on the line of the railroad.

7. That appropriations by Congress for the improvement of rivers and harbors of a national character, required for the accommodation and security of our existing commerce, are authorized by the Constitution and justified by the obligation of Government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

8. That we invite the affiliation and cooperation of freemen of all parties, however differing from us in other respects, in support of the principles herein declared; and, believing that the spirit of our institutions, as well as the Constitution of our country, guarantees liberty of conscience and equality of rights among citizens, we oppose all legislation impairing their security.

DEMOCRATIC, CINCINNATI, JUNE, 1856.

The platform reiterates in detail the resolutions adopted in 1852, down to and including the eighth resolution, and adds the following:

And whereas, since the foregoing declaration was uniformly adopted by our predecessors in national conventions, an adverse political and religious test has been secretly organized by a party claiming to be exclusively American, it is proper that the American Democracy should clearly define its relation thereto, and declare its determined opposition to all secret political societies, by whatever name they may be called.

Resolved, That the foundation of this Union of States having been laid in, and its prosperity, expansion, and preëminent example in free government built upon, entire freedom in matters of religious concernment, and no respect of person in regard to rank or place of birth, no party can justly be deemed national, constitutional, or in accordance with American principles, which bases its exclusive organization upon religious opinions and accidental birthplace. And hence a political crusade in the nineteenth century, and in the United States of America, against Catholic and foreign-born, is neither justified by the past history or the future prospects of the country, nor in unison with the spirit of toleration and enlarged freedom which peculiarly distinguishes the American system of popular government.

And that we may more distinctly meet the issue on which a sectional party, subsisting exclusively on slavery agitation, now relies to test the fidelity of the people, North and South, to the Constitution and the Union:

1. *Resolved*, That claiming fellowship with, and desiring the coöperation of, all who regard the preservation of the Union under the Constitution as the paramount issue, and repudiating all sectional parties and platforms concerning domestic slavery, which seek to embroil the States and incite to treason and armed resistance to law in the Territories, and whose avowed purpose, if consummated, must end in civil war and disunion, the American Democracy recognize and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the "slavery question," upon which the great national idea of the people of this whole country can repose in its determined conservatism of the Union—NON-INTERFERENCE BY CONGRESS WITH SLAVERY IN STATE AND TERRITORY, OR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

2. That this was the basis of the compromises

of 1850, confirmed by both the Democratic and Whig parties in national conventions, ratified by the people in the election of 1852, and rightly applied to the organization of Territories in 1854.

3. That by the uniform application of this democratic principle to the organization of Territories, and to the admission of new States, with or without domestic slavery, as they may elect, the equal rights of all the States will be preserved intact, the original compacts of the Constitution maintained inviolate, and the perpetuity and expansion of this Union insured to its utmost capacity of embracing, in peace and harmony, every future American State that may be constituted or annexed with a republican form of government.

Resolved, That we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of a majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a constitution, with or without domestic slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States.

Resolved, finally, That in view of the condition of popular institutions in the Old World (and the dangerous tendencies of sectional agitation, combined with the attempt to enforce civil and religious disabilities against the rights of acquiring and enjoying citizenship in our own land), a high and sacred duty is devolved with increased responsibility upon the Democratic party of this country, as the party of the Union, to uphold and maintain the rights of every State, and thereby the Union of the States; and to sustain and advance among us constitutional liberty, by continuing to resist all monopolies and exclusive legislation for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and by a vigilant and constant adherence to those principles and compromises of the Constitution, which are broad enough and strong enough to embrace and uphold the Union as it was, the Union as it is, and the Union as it shall be, in the full expansion of the energies and capacity of this great and progressive people.

1. *Resolved*, That there are questions connected with the foreign policy of this country, which are inferior to no domestic question whatever. The time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas and progressive free trade throughout the world, by solemn manifestations, to place their moral influence at the side of their successful example.

2. *Resolved*, That our geographical and political position with reference to the other States of this continent, no less than the interest of our commerce and the development of our growing power, requires that we should hold as sacred the principles involved in the Monroe doctrine, their bearing and import admit of no misconstruction; they should be applied with unbending rigidity.

3. *Resolved*, That the great highway which nature, as well as the assent of the States most immediately interested in its maintenance, has marked out for a free communication between the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans, constitutes one of the most important achievements realized by the spirit of modern times and the unconquerable energy of our people. That result should be secured by a timely and efficient exertion of the control which we have the right to claim over it, and no power on earth should be suffered to impede or clog its progress by any interference with the relations it may suit our policy to establish between our Government and the governments of the States within whose dominions it lies. We can, under no circumstances, surrender our preponderance in the adjustment of all questions arising out of it.

4. *Resolved*, That, in view of so commanding an interest, the people of the United States can not but sympathize with the efforts which are being made by the people of Central America to regenerate that portion of the continent which covers the passage across the interoceanic isthmus.

5. *Resolved*, That the Democratic party will expect of the next administration that every proper effort be made to insure our ascendancy in the Gulf of Mexico, and to maintain a permanent protection to the great outlets through which are emptied into its waters the products raised out of the soil and the commodities created by the industry of the people of our Western valleys and of the Union at large.

Resolved, That the Democratic party recognizes the great importance, in a political and commercial point of view, of a safe and speedy communication through our own territory between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the Union, and that it is the duty of the Federal Government to exercise all its constitutional power to the attainment of that object, thereby binding the Union of these States in indissoluble bonds, and opening to the rich commerce of Asia an overland transit from the Pacific to the Mississippi River, and the great lakes of the North.

REPUBLICAN, CHICAGO, MAY, 1860.

Resolved, That we, the delegated representatives of the Republican electors of the United States, in Convention assembled, in discharge of the duty we owe to our constituents and our country, unite in the following declarations :

1. That the history of the nation, during the last four years, has fully established the propriety and necessity of the organization and perpetuation of the Republican party, and that the causes which called it into existence are permanent in their nature, and now, more than ever before, demand its peaceful and constitutional triumph.

2. That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution, "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions; and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States, must and shall be preserved.

3. That to the Union of the States this nation owes its unprecedented increase in population, its surprising development of material resources, its rapid augmentation of wealth, its happiness at home, and its honor abroad; and we hold in abhorrence all schemes for disunion, come from whatever source they may; and we congratulate the country that no Republican member of Congress has uttered or countenanced the threats of disunion so often made by Democratic members, without rebuke and with applause from their political associates, and we denounce those threats of disunion, in case of a popular overthrow of their ascendancy, as denying the vital principles of a free government, and as an avowal of contemplated treason, which it is the imperative duty of an indignant people sternly to rebuke and for ever silence

4. That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

5. That the present Democratic Administration has far exceeded our worst apprehensions, in its measureless subserviency to the exactions of a sectional interest, as especially evinced in its desperate exertions to force the infamous Le-compton Constitution upon the protesting people of Kansas; in construing the personal relation between master and servant to involve an unqualified property in persons; in its attempted enforcement everywhere, on land and sea, through the intervention of Congress and of the Federal courts, of the extreme pretensions of a purely local interest; and in its general and unvarying abuse of the power intrusted to it by a confiding people.

6. That the people justly view with alarm the reckless extravagance which pervades every department of the Federal Government; that a return to rigid economy and accountability is indispensable to arrest the systematic plunder of the public treasury by favored partisans, while the recent startling developments of frauds and corruptions at the Federal metropolis show that an entire change of administration is imperatively demanded.

7. That the new dogma, that the Constitution, of its own force, carries slavery into any or all of the Territories of the United States, is a dangerous political heresy, at variance with the explicit provisions of that instrument itself, with contemporaneous exposition, and with legislative and judicial precedent; is revolutionary in its tendency, and subversive of the peace and harmony of the country.

8. That the normal condition of all the territory of the United States is that of freedom; that as our republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that "no person should be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law," it becomes our duty, by legislation, whenever such legislation is necessary, to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it; and we deny the authority of Congress, of a territorial legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States.

9. That we brand the recent reopening of the African slave-trade, under the cover of our national flag, aided by perversions of judicial power, as a crime against humanity and a burning shame to our country and age; and we call upon Congress to take prompt and efficient measures for the total and final suppression of that execrable traffic.

10. That in the recent vetoes, by their Fede-

ral governors, of the acts of the legislatures of Kansas and Nebraska, prohibiting slavery in those Territories, we find a practical illustration of the boasted Democratic principle of non-intervention and popular sovereignty, embodied in the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, and a demonstration of the deception and fraud involved therein.

11. That Kansas should of right be immediately admitted as a State under the Constitution recently formed and adopted by her people and accepted by the House of Representatives.

12. That, while providing revenue for the support of the General Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country; and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence.

13. That we protest against any sale or alienation to others of the public lands held by actual settlers, and against any view of the free homestead policy which regards the settlers as paupers or suppliants for public bounty; and we demand the passage by Congress of the complete and satisfactory homestead measure which has already passed the House.

14. That the Republican party is opposed to any change in our naturalization laws, or any State legislation, by which the rights of citizenship hitherto accorded to immigrants from foreign lands shall be abridged or impaired; and in favor of giving a full and efficient protection to the rights of all classes of citizens, whether native or naturalized, both at home and abroad.

15. That appropriations by Congress for river and harbor improvements of a national character, required for the accommodation and security of an existing commerce, are authorized by the Constitution and justified by the obligation of Government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

16. That a railroad to the Pacific Ocean is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country; that the Federal Government ought to render immediate and efficient aid in its construction; and that, as preliminary thereto, a daily overland mail should be promptly established.

17. Finally, having thus set forth our distinctive principles and views, we invite the coöperation of all citizens, however differing on other

questions, who substantially agree with us in their affirmance and support.

DEMOCRATIC (DOUGLAS) PLATFORM,
CHARLESTON AND BALTIMORE,
JUNE, 1860.

1. *Resolved*, That we, the Democracy of the Union, in convention assembled, hereby declare our affirmance of the resolutions unanimously adopted and declared as a platform of principles by the Democratic Convention in Cincinnati, in the year 1856, believing that Democratic principles are unchangeable in their nature, when applied to the same subject-matters; and we recommend, as the only further resolutions, the following.

2. *Resolved*, That it is the duty of the United States to afford ample and complete protection to all its citizens, whether at home or abroad, and whether native or foreign.

3. *Resolved*, That one of the necessities of the age, in a military, commercial, and postal point of view, is speedy communication between the Atlantic and Pacific States; and the Democratic party pledge such constitutional Government aid as will insure the construction of a railroad to the Pacific coast at the earliest practicable period.

4. *Resolved*, That the Democratic party are in favor of the acquisition of the Island of Cuba, on such terms as shall be honorable to ourselves and just to Spain.

5. *Resolved*, That the enactments of State legislatures to defeat the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave law are hostile in character, subversive of the Constitution, and revolutionary in their effect.

6. *Resolved*, That it is in accordance with the true interpretation of the Cincinnati platform that, during the existence of the Territorial governments, the measure of restriction, whatever it may be, imposed by the Federal Constitution on the power of the Territorial Legislature over the subject of the domestic relations, as the same has been, or shall hereafter be, finally determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, should be respected by all good citizens, and enforced with promptness and fidelity by every branch of the General Government.

DEMOCRATIC (BRECKINRIDGE) PLATFORM, ADOPTED AT CHARLESTON AND BALTIMORE, JUNE, 1860.

Resolved, That the platform adopted by the Democratic party at Cincinnati be affirmed, with the following explanatory resolutions.

1. That the government of a Territory organized by an act of Congress is provisional and temporary, and during its existence all citizens of the United States have an equal right to settle with their property in the Territory, without their rights, either of person or property, being destroyed or impaired by Congressional or Territorial legislation.

2. That it is the duty of the Federal Government, in all its departments, to protect, when necessary, the rights of persons and property in the Territories, and wherever else its constitutional authority extends.

3. That when the settlers in a Territory, having an adequate population, form a State constitution, the right of sovereignty commences, and, being consummated by admission into the Union, they stand on an equal footing with the people of other States; and the State thus organized ought to be admitted into the Federal Union, whether its constitution prohibits or recognizes the institution of slavery.

4. That the Democratic party are in favor of the acquisition of the Island of Cuba, on such terms as shall be honorable to ourselves and just to Spain, at the earliest practicable moment.

5. That the enactments of State legislatures to defeat the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave law are hostile in character, subversive of the Constitution, and revolutionary in their effect.

6. That the Democracy of the United States recognize it as the imperative duty of this Government to protect the naturalized citizen in all his rights, whether at home or in foreign lands, to the same extent as its native-born citizens.

Whereas, one of the greatest necessities of the age, in a political, commercial, postal, and military point of view, is a speedy communication between the Pacific and Atlantic coasts; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Democratic party do hereby pledge themselves to use every means in their power to secure the passage of some bill, to the extent of the constitutional authority of Congress, for the construction of a Pacific Railroad from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean, at the earliest practicable moment.

REPUBLICAN, AT BALTIMORE, JUNE, 1864.

Resolved, That it is the highest duty of every American citizen to maintain against all their enemies the integrity of the Union and the paramount authority of the Constitution and laws of the United States; and that, laying aside all differences of political opinion, we pledge ourselves as Union men, animated by a common sentiment, and aiming at a common object, to do everything in our power to aid the Government in quelling by force of arms the rebellion now raging against its authority, and in bringing to the punishment due to their crimes the rebels and traitors arrayed against it.

2. That we approve the determination of the Government of the United States not to compromise with rebels, or to offer them any terms of peace, except such as may be based upon an unconditional surrender of their hostility and a return to their just allegiance to the Constitution and laws of the United States; and that we call upon the Government to maintain this position and to prosecute the war with the utmost possible vigor to the complete suppression of the rebellion, in full reliance upon the self-sacrificing patriotism, the heroic valor, and the undying devotion of the American people to the country and its free institutions.

3. That as slavery was the cause, and now constitutes the strength, of this rebellion, and as it must be always and everywhere hostile to the principles of republican government, justice and the national safety demand its utter and complete extirpation from the soil of the republic; and that while we uphold and maintain the acts and proclamations by which the Government, in its own defense, has aimed a death-blow at this gigantic evil, we are in favor, furthermore, of such an amendment to the Constitution, to be made by the people in conformity with its provisions, as shall terminate and for ever prohibit the existence of slavery within the limits of the jurisdiction of the United States.

4. That the thanks of the American people are due to the soldiers and sailors of the army and navy, who have periled their lives in defense of their country and in vindication of the honor of its flag; that the nation owes to them some permanent recognition of their patriotism and their valor, and ample and permanent provision for those of their survivors who have received disabling and honorable wounds in the service of the country; and that the memories of those who have fallen in its defense shall be held in grateful and everlasting remembrance.

5. That we approve and applaud the practical wisdom, the unselfish patriotism, and the unswerving fidelity to the Constitution and the principles of American liberty with which Abraham Lincoln has discharged, under circumstances of unparalleled difficulty, the great duties and responsibilities of the Presidential office; that we approve and endorse, as demanded by the emergency and essential to the preservation of the nation, and as within the provisions of the Constitution, the measures and acts which he has adopted to defend the nation against its open and secret foes; that we approve especially the Proclamation of Emancipation and the employment as Union soldiers of men heretofore held in slavery; and that we have full confidence in his determination to carry these and all other constitutional measures essential to the salvation of the country into full and complete effect.

6. That we deem it essential to the general welfare that harmony should prevail in the national councils, and we regard as worthy of public confidence and official trust those only who cordially endorse the principles proclaimed in these resolutions, and which should characterize the administration of the Government.

7. That the Government owes to all men employed in its armies, without regard to distinction of color, the full protection of the laws of war; and that any violation of these laws, or of the usages of civilized nations in time of war, by the rebels now in arms, should be made the subject of prompt and full redress.

8. That foreign immigration, which in the past has added so much to the wealth, development of resources, and increase of power of the nation—the asylum of the oppressed of all nations—should be fostered and encouraged by a liberal and just policy.

9. That we are in favor of the speedy construction of the railroad to the Pacific coast.

10. That the national faith, pledged for the redemption of the public debt, must be kept inviolate, and that for this purpose we recommend economy and rigid responsibility in the public expenditures, and a vigorous and just system of taxation; and that it is the duty of every loyal State to sustain the credit and promote the use of the national currency.

11. That we approve the position taken by the Government that the people of the United States can never regard with indifference the attempt of any European power to overthrow by force, or to supplant by fraud, the institutions of any republican government on the western continent; and that they will view with extreme

jealousy, as menacing to the peace and independence of their own country, the efforts of any such power to obtain new footholds for monarchical governments, sustained by foreign military force, in near proximity to the United States.

DEMOCRATIC, CHICAGO, 1864.

Resolved, That in the future, as in the past, we will adhere, with unswerving fidelity, to the Union under the Constitution as the only solid foundation of our strength, security, and happiness as a people, and as a framework of government equally conducive to the welfare and prosperity of all the States, both Northern and Southern.

Resolved, That this Convention does explicitly declare as the sense of the American people, that after four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war, during which, under the pretense of a military necessity or war-power higher than the Constitution, the Constitution itself has been disregarded in every part, and public liberty and private right alike trodden down, and the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired, justice, humanity, liberty, and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities, with a view to an ultimate convention of the States, or other peaceable means, to the end that, at the earliest practicable moment, peace may be restored on the basis of the Federal Union of the States.

Resolved, That the direct interference of the military authorities of the United States in the recent elections held in Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, and Delaware was a shameful violation of the Constitution; and a repetition of such acts in the approaching election will be held as revolutionary, and resisted with all the means and power under our control.

Resolved, That the aim and object of the Democratic party is to preserve the Federal Union and the rights of the States unimpaired, and they hereby declare that they consider that the administrative usurpation of extraordinary and dangerous powers not granted by the Constitution—the subversion of the civil by military law in States not in insurrection; the arbitrary military arrest, imprisonment, trial, and sentence of American citizens in States where civil law exists in full force; the suppression of freedom of speech and of the press; the denial of the right of asylum; the open and avowed disregard of State rights; the employment of un-

usual test-oaths; and the interference with and denial of the right of the people to bear arms in their defense—are calculated to prevent a restoration of the Union and the perpetuation of a Government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

Resolved, That the shameful disregard of the Administration to its duty in respect to our fellow citizens who now are and long have been prisoners of war in a suffering condition deserves the severest reprobation on the score alike of public policy and common humanity.

Resolved, That the sympathy of the Democratic party is heartily and earnestly extended to the soldiers of our army and sailors of our navy, who are and have been in the field and on the sea under the flag of our country; and, in the event of its attaining power, they will receive all the care, protection, and regard that the brave soldiers and sailors of the republic so nobly earned.

REPUBLICAN, CHICAGO, 1868.

The National Republican party of the United States, assembled in National Convention, in the city of Chicago, on the 21st day of May, 1868, make the following declaration of principles:

1. We congratulate the country on the assured success of the reconstruction policy of Congress, as evinced by the adoption, in the majority of the States lately in rebellion, of constitutions securing equal civil and political rights to all; and it is the duty of the Government to sustain those institutions, and to prevent the people of such States from being remitted to a state of anarchy.

2. The guarantee by Congress of equal suffrage to all loyal men at the South was demanded by every consideration of public safety, of gratitude, and of justice, and must be maintained; while the question of suffrage in all the loyal States properly belongs to the people of those States.

3. We denounce all forms of repudiation as a national crime; and the national honor requires the payment of the public indebtedness in the uttermost good faith to all creditors at home and abroad, not only according to the letter, but the spirit, of the laws under which it was contracted.

4. It is due to the labor of the nation that taxation should be equalized, and reduced as rapidly as the national faith will permit.

5. The national debt, contracted as it has been for the preservation of the Union for all time to come, should be extended over a fair

period for redemption; and it is the duty of Congress to reduce the rate of interest thereon, whenever it can be honestly done.

6. That the best policy to diminish our burden of debt is to so improve our credit that capitalists will seek to loan us money at lower rates of interest than we now pay, and must continue to pay so long as repudiation, partial or total, open or covert, is threatened or suspected.

7. The Government of the United States should be administered with the strictest economy; and the corruptions which have been so shamefully nursed and fostered by Andrew Johnson call loudly for radical reform.

8. We profoundly deplore the untimely and tragic death of Abraham Lincoln, and regret the accession to the Presidency of Andrew Johnson, who has acted treacherously to the people who elected him and the cause he was pledged to support; who has usurped high legislative and judicial functions; who has refused to execute the laws; who has used his high office to induce other officers to ignore and violate the laws; who has employed his executive powers to render insecure the property, the peace, liberty, and life of the citizen; who has abused the pardoning power; who has denounced the National Legislature as unconstitutional; who has persistently and corruptly resisted, by every means in his power, every proper attempt at the reconstruction of the States lately in rebellion; who has perverted the public patronage into an engine of wholesale corruption; and who has been justly impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and properly pronounced guilty thereof by the vote of thirty-five Senators.

9. The doctrine of Great Britain and other European powers, that because a man is once a subject he is always so, must be resisted at every hazard by the United States as a relic of feudal times, not authorized by the laws of nations, and at war with our national honor and independence. Naturalized citizens are entitled to protection in all their rights of citizenship, as though they were native-born; and no citizen of the United States, native or naturalized, must be liable to arrest and imprisonment by any foreign power for acts done or words spoken in this country; and, if so arrested and imprisoned, it is the duty of the Government to interfere in his behalf.

10. Of all who were faithful in the trials of the late war, there were none entitled to more especial honor than the brave soldiers and seamen who endured the hardships of campaign and cruise, and imperiled their lives in the service of the country; the bounties and pensions provided

by the laws for these brave defenders of the nation are obligations never to be forgotten; the widows and orphans of the gallant dead are the wards of the people—a sacred legacy bequeathed to the nation's protecting care.

11. Foreign immigration, which in the past has added so much to the wealth, development of the resources, and increase of power of this republic, the asylum of the oppressed of all nations, should be fostered and encouraged by a liberal and just policy.

12. This Convention declares itself in sympathy with all oppressed people struggling for their rights.

13. That we highly commend the spirit of magnanimity and forbearance with which men who have served in the rebellion, but who now frankly and honestly cooperate with us in restoring the peace of the country and reconstructing the Southern State governments upon the basis of impartial justice and equal rights, are received back into the communion of the loyal people; and we favor the removal of the disqualifications and restrictions imposed upon the late rebels in the same measure as the spirit of disloyalty will die out, and as may be consistent with the safety of the loyal people.

14. That we recognize the great principles laid down in the immortal Declaration of Independence, as the true foundation of democratic government, and we hail with gladness every effort toward making these principles a living reality on every inch of American soil.

DEMOCRATIC, NEW YORK, 1868.

The Democratic party, in National Convention assembled, reposing its trust in the intelligence, patriotism, and discriminating justice of the people, standing upon the Constitution as the foundation and limitation of the powers of the Government, and the guarantee of the liberties of the citizen, and recognizing the questions of slavery and secession as having been settled, for all time to come, by the war or the voluntary action of the Southern States in constitutional conventions assembled, and never to be renewed or reagitated, do, with the return of peace, demand:

First. Immediate restoration of all the States to their rights in the Union under the Constitution, and of civil government to the American people.

Second. Amnesty for all past political offenses, and the regulation of the elective franchise in the States by their citizens.

Third. Payment of the public debt of the United States as rapidly as practicable; all moneys drawn from the people by taxation, except so much as is requisite for the necessities of the Government, economically administered, being honestly applied to such payment; and, where the obligations of the Government do not expressly state upon their face, or the law under which they were issued does not provide that they shall be paid in coin, they ought, in right and in justice, to be paid in the lawful money of the United States.

Fourth. Equal taxation of every species of property according to its real value, including Government bonds and other public securities.

Fifth. One currency for the Government and the people, the laborer and the officeholder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder.

Sixth. Economy in the administration of the Government; the reduction of the standing army and navy; the abolition of the Freedman's Bureau, and all political instrumentalities designed to secure negro supremacy; simplification of the system, and discontinuance of inquisitorial modes of assessing and collecting internal revenue, so that the burden of taxation may be equalized and lessened; the credit of the Government and the currency made good; the repeal of all enactments for enrolling the State militia into national forces in time of peace; and a tariff for revenue upon foreign imports, and such equal taxation under the internal revenue laws as will afford incidental protection to domestic manufactures, and as will, without impairing the revenue, impose the least burden upon and best promote and encourage the great industrial interests of the country.

Seventh. Reform of abuses in the administration, the expulsion of corrupt men from office, the abrogation of useless offices, the restoration of rightful authority to, and the independence of, the executive and judicial departments of the Government, the subordination of the military to the civil power, to the end that the usurpations of Congress and the despotism of the sword may cease.

Eighth. Equal rights and protection for naturalized and native-born citizens at home and abroad, the assertion of American nationality which shall command the respect of foreign powers, and furnish an example and encouragement to people struggling for national integrity, constitutional liberty, and individual rights, and the maintenance of the rights of naturalized citizens against the absolute doctrine of immutable

allegiance, and the claims of foreign powers to punish them for alleged crime committed beyond their jurisdiction.

In demanding these measures and reforms, we arraign the Radical party for its disregard of right, and the unparalleled oppression and tyranny which have marked its career.

After the most solemn and unanimous pledge of both Houses of Congress to prosecute the war exclusively for the maintenance of the Government and the preservation of the Union under the Constitution, it has repeatedly violated that most sacred pledge under which alone was rallied that noble volunteer army which carried our flag to victory. Instead of restoring the Union, it has, so far as in its power, dissolved it, and subjected ten States, in time of profound peace, to military despotism and negro supremacy. It has nullified there the right of trial by jury; it has abolished the *habeas corpus*, that most sacred writ of liberty; it has overthrown the freedom of speech and the press; it has substituted arbitrary seizures and arrests and military trials and secret star-chamber inquisitions for the constitutional tribunals; it has disregarded in time of peace the right of the people to be free from searches and seizures; it has entered the post and telegraph offices, and even the private rooms of individuals, and seized their private papers and letters without any specific charge or notice of affidavit, as required by the organic law; it has converted the American Capitol into a Bastille; it has established a system of spies and official espionage to which no constitutional monarchy of Europe would now dare to resort; it has abolished the right of appeal on important constitutional questions to the supreme judicial tribunal, and threatens to curtail or destroy its original jurisdiction, which is irrevocably vested by the Constitution, while the learned Chief Justice has been subjected to the most atrocious calumnies, merely because he would not prostitute his high office to the support of the false and partisan charges preferred against the President. Its corruption and extravagance have exceeded anything known in history, and, by its frauds and monopolies, it has nearly doubled the burden of the debt created by the war. It has stripped the President of his constitutional power of appointment, even of his own Cabinet. Under its repeated assaults, the pillars of the Government are rocking on their base; and should it succeed in November next and inaugurate its President, we will meet as a subjected and conquered people, amid the ruins of liberty and the scattered fragments of the Constitution.

And we do declare and resolve that ever since the people of the United States threw off all subjection to the British Crown, the privilege and trust of suffrage have belonged to the several States, and have been granted, regulated, and controlled exclusively by the political power of each State respectively, and that any attempt by Congress, on any pretext whatever, to deprive any State of this right, or interfere with its exercise, is a flagrant usurpation of power which can find no warrant in the Constitution, and, if sanctioned by the people, will subvert our form of government, and can only end in a single centralized and consolidated government, in which the separate existence of the States will be entirely absorbed, and an unqualified despotism be established in place of a Federal union of co-equal States.

And that we regard the reconstruction acts (so called) of Congress, as such, as usurpations and unconstitutional, revolutionary, and void. That our soldiers and sailors, who carried the flag of our country to victory against a most gallant and determined foe, must ever be gratefully remembered, and all the guarantees given in their favor must be faithfully carried into execution.

That the public lands should be distributed as widely as possible among the people, and should be disposed of either under the preëmption of homestead lands or sold in reasonable quantities, and to none but actual occupants, at the minimum price established by the Government. When grants of the public lands may be allowed, necessary for the encouragement of important public improvements, the proceeds of the sale of such lands, and not the lands themselves, should be so applied.

That the President of the United States, Andrew Johnson, in exercising the power of his high office in resisting the aggressions of Congress upon the constitutional rights of the States and the people, is entitled to the gratitude of the whole American people, and in behalf of the Democratic party we tender him our thanks for his patriotic efforts in that regard.

Upon this platform the Democratic party appeal to every patriot, including all the conservative elements and all who desire to support the Constitution and restore the Union, forgetting all past differences of opinion, to unite with us in the present great struggle for the liberties of the people; and that to all such, to whatever party they may have heretofore belonged, we extend the right hand of fellowship, and hail all such coöperating with us as friends and brethren.

Resolved, That this Convention sympathizes

cordially with the workingmen of the United States in their efforts to protect the rights and interests of the laboring classes of the country.

Resolved, That the thanks of the Convention are tendered to Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase, for the justice, dignity, and impartiality with which he presided over the court of impeachment on the trial of President Andrew Johnson.

REPUBLICAN, PHILADELPHIA, 1872.

The Republican party of the United States, assembled in National Convention in the city of Philadelphia, on the 5th and 6th days of June, 1872, again declares its faith, appeals to its history, and announces its position upon the questions before the country.

First. During eleven years of supremacy it has accepted with grand courage the solemn duties of the time. It suppressed a gigantic rebellion, emancipated four millions of slaves, decreed the equal citizenship of all, and established universal suffrage. Exhibiting unparalleled magnanimity, it criminally punished no man for political offenses, and warmly welcomed all who proved their loyalty by obeying the laws and dealing justly with their neighbors. It has steadily decreased, with a firm hand, the resultant disorders of a great war, and initiated a wise policy toward the Indians. The Pacific Railroad and similar vast enterprises have been generously aided and successfully conducted, the public lands freely given to actual settlers; immigration protected and encouraged, and a full acknowledgment of the naturalized citizens' rights secured from European powers. A uniform national currency has been provided; repudiation frowned down; the national credit sustained under most extraordinary burdens, and new bonds negotiated at lower rates; the revenues have been carefully collected and honestly applied. Despite the annual large reductions of rates of taxation, the public debt has been reduced during General Grant's Presidency at the rate of \$100,000,000 a year. A great financial crisis has been avoided, and peace and plenty prevail throughout the land. Menacing foreign difficulties have been peacefully and honorably compromised, and the honor and the power of the nation kept in high respect throughout the world. This glorious record of the past is the party's best pledge for the future. We believe the people will not intrust the Government to any party or combination of men composed chiefly of those who have resisted every step of this beneficial progress.

Second. Complete liberty and exact equality

in the enjoyment of all civil, political, and public rights should be established, and effectually maintained throughout the Union, by efficient and appropriate State and Federal legislation. Neither the law nor its administration should admit of any discrimination in respect of citizens by reason of race, creed, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Third. The recent amendments to the National Constitution should be cordially sustained because they are right, not merely tolerated because they are law, and should be carried out according to their spirit by appropriate legislation, the enforcement of which can be safely trusted only to the party that secured those amendments.

Fourth. The National Government should seek to maintain an honorable peace with all nations, protecting its citizens everywhere, and sympathizing with all peoples who strive for greater liberty.

Fifth. Any system of the civil service under which the subordinate positions of the Government are considered rewards for mere party zeal is fatally demoralizing; and we, therefore, favor a reform of the system by laws which shall abolish the evils of patronage, and make honesty, efficiency, and fidelity the essential qualifications for public position, without practically creating a life-tenure of office.

Sixth. We are opposed to further grants of the public lands to corporations and monopolies, and demand that the national domain be set apart for free homes for the people.

Seventh. The annual revenues, after paying the current debts, should furnish a moderate balance for the reduction of the principal, and the revenue, except so much as may be derived from a tax on tobacco and liquors, be raised by duties upon importations, the duties of which should be so adjusted as to aid in securing remunerative wages to labor, and promote the industries, growth, and prosperity of the whole country.

Eighth. We hold in undying honor the soldiers and sailors whose valor saved the Union; their pensions are a sacred debt of the nation, and the widows and orphans of those who died for their country are entitled to the care of a generous and grateful people. We favor such additional legislation as will extend the bounty of the Government to all our soldiers and sailors who were honorably discharged, and who in the line of duty became disabled, without regard to the length of service or the cause of such discharge.

Ninth. The doctrine of Great Britain and other European powers concerning allegiance—

"Once a subject always a subject"—having at last, through the efforts of the Republican party, been abandoned, and the American idea of the individual's right to transfer his allegiance having been accepted by European nations, it is the duty of our Government to guard with jealous care the rights of adopted citizens against the assumption of unauthorized claims by their former government; and we urge the continual and careful encouragement and protection of voluntary immigration.

Tenth. The franking privilege ought to be abolished, and the way prepared for a speedy reduction in the rate of postage.

Eleventh. Among the questions which press for attention is that which concerns the relations of capital and labor, and the Republican party recognize the duty of so shaping legislation as to secure full protection and the amplest field for capital, and for labor, the creator of capital, the largest opportunities and a just share of the mutual profits of these two great servants of civilization.

Twelfth. We hold that Congress and the President have only fulfilled an imperative duty in their measures for the suppression of violent and treasonable organizations in certain lately rebellious regions, and for the protection of the ballot-box, and therefore they are entitled to the thanks of the nation.

Thirteenth. We denounce repudiation of the public debt in any form or disguise as a national crime. We witness with pride the reduction of the principal of the debt and of the rates of interest upon the balance, and confidently expect that our excellent national currency will be perfected by a speedy resumption of specie payments.

Fourteenth. The Republican party is mindful of its obligations to the loyal women of America, for their noble devotion to the cause of freedom. Their admission to wider fields of usefulness is received with satisfaction, and the honest demands of any class of citizens for additional rights should be treated with respectful consideration.

Fifteenth. We heartily approve the action of Congress in extending amnesty to those lately in rebellion, and rejoice in the growth of peace and fraternal feeling throughout the land.

Sixteenth. The Republican party propose to respect the rights reserved by the people to themselves as carefully as the powers delegated by them to the State and to the Federal Government. It disapproves of the resort to unconstitutional laws for the purpose of removing evils by inter-

ference with rights not surrendered by the people to either the State or National Government.

Seventeenth. It is the duty of the General Government to adopt such measures as will tend to encourage American commerce and shipbuilding.

Eighteenth. We believe that the modest patriotism, the earnest purpose, the sound judgment, the practical wisdom, the incorruptible integrity, and the illustrious services of Ulysses S. Grant have commended him to the heart of the American people; and with him at our head we start to-day upon a new march to victory.

LIBERAL-REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM, 1872.

[Adopted by the Liberal-Republican Convention at Cincinnati in June, and by the Democratic National Convention at Baltimore in July.]

First. We recognize the equality of all men before the law, and hold that it is the duty of Government in its dealings with the people to mete out equal and exact justice to all, of whatever nativity, race, color, or persuasion, religious or political.

Second. We pledge ourselves to maintain the union of these States, emancipation, and enfranchisement, and to oppose any reopening of the questions settled by the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution.

Third. We demand the immediate and absolute removal of all disabilities imposed on account of the rebellion, which was finally subdued seven years ago, believing that universal amnesty will result in complete pacification in all sections of the country.

Fourth. Local self-government, with impartial suffrage, will guard the rights of all citizens more securely than any centralized power. The public welfare requires the supremacy of the civil over the military authority, and freedom of persons under the protection of *habeas corpus*. We demand for the individual the largest liberty consistent with public order; for the State, self-government; and for the nation, a return to the methods of peace and the constitutional limitations of power.

Fifth. The civil service of the Government has become a mere instrument of partisan tyranny and personal ambition, and an object of selfish greed. It is a scandal and reproach upon free institutions, and breeds a demoralization dangerous to the perpetuity of republican government. We, therefore, regard such thorough reforms of the civil service as one of the most pressing ne-

cessities of the hour; that honesty, capacity, and fidelity constitute the only valid claim to public employment; that the offices of the Government cease to be a matter of arbitrary favoritism and patronage; that the public station become again the post of honor. To this end it is imperatively required that no President shall be a candidate for reelection.

Sixth. We demand a system of Federal taxation which shall not unnecessarily interfere with the industry of the people, and which shall provide the means necessary to pay the expenses of the Government economically administered, the pensions, the interest on the public debt, and a moderate reduction annually of the principal thereof; and, recognizing that there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of Protection and Free Trade, we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in their Congress districts, and to the decision of the Congress thereon, wholly free of Executive interference or dictation.

Seventh. The public credit must be sacredly maintained, and we denounce repudiation in every form and guise.

Eighth. A speedy return to specie payment is demanded alike by the highest considerations of commercial morality and honest government.

Ninth. We remember with gratitude the heroism and sacrifices of the soldiers and sailors of the republic, and no act of ours shall ever detract from their justly earned fame for the full reward of their patriotism.

Tenth. We are opposed to all further grants of lands to railroads or other corporations. The public domain should be held sacred to actual settlers.

Eleventh. We hold that it is the duty of the Government, in its intercourse with foreign nations, to cultivate the friendship of peace, by treating with all on fair and equal terms, regarding it alike dishonorable either to demand what is not right, or to submit to what is wrong.

Twelfth. For the promotion and success of these vital principles, and the support of the candidates nominated by this Convention, we invite and cordially welcome the coöperation of all patriotic citizens, without regard to previous affiliations.

REPUBLICAN, CINCINNATI, 1876.

When, in the economy of Providence, this land was to be purged of human slavery, and when the strength of government of the people by the people and for the people was to be demon-

strated, the Republican party came into power. Its deeds have passed into history, and we look back to them with pride. Inspired by their memories to high aims for the good of our country and mankind, and looking to the future with unflinching courage, hope, and purpose, we, the representatives of the party in National Convention assembled, make the following declaration of principles:

1. The United States of America is a Nation, not a league. By the combined workings of the National and State Governments, under their respective constitutions, the rights of every citizen are secured at home and abroad, and the common welfare promoted.

2. The Republican party has preserved these Governments to the hundredth anniversary of the Nation's birth, and they are now embodiments of the great truths spoken at its cradle—"that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that for the attainment of these ends governments have been instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Until these truths are cheerfully obeyed, or, if need be, vigorously enforced, the work of the Republican party is unfinished.

3. The permanent pacification of the Southern section of the Union, and the complete protection of all its citizens in the free enjoyment of all their rights, is a duty to which the Republican party stands sacredly pledged. The power to provide for the enforcement of the principles embodied in the recent constitutional amendments is vested by those amendments in the Congress of the United States; and we declare it to be the solemn obligation of the legislative and executive departments of the Government to put into immediate and vigorous exercise all their constitutional powers for removing any just causes of discontent on the part of any class, and for securing to every American citizen complete liberty and exact equality in the exercise of all civil, political, and public rights. To this end we imperatively demand a Congress and a Chief Executive whose courage and fidelity to these duties shall not falter until these results are placed beyond dispute or recall.

4. In the first act of Congress signed by President Grant, the National Government assumed to remove any doubts of its purpose to discharge all just obligations to the public creditors, and "solemnly pledged its faith to make provision at the earliest practicable period for the redemption

of the United States notes in coin." Commercial prosperity, public morals, and national credit demand that this promise be fulfilled by a continuous and steady progress to specie payment.

5. Under the Constitution, the President and heads of departments are to make nominations for office; the Senate is to advise and consent to appointments, and the House of Representatives is to accuse and prosecute faithless officers. The best interest of the public service demands that these distinctions be respected; that Senators and Representatives who may be judges and accusers should not dictate appointments to office. The invariable rule in appointments should have reference to the honesty, fidelity, and capacity of the appointees, giving to the party in power those places where harmony and vigor of administration require its policy to be represented, but permitting all others to be filled by persons selected with sole reference to the efficiency of the public service, and the right of all citizens to share in the honor of rendering faithful service to the country.

6. We rejoice in the quickened conscience of the people concerning political affairs, and will hold all public officers to a rigid responsibility, and engage that the prosecution and punishment of all who betray official trusts shall be swift, thorough, and unsparing.

7. The public school system of the several States is the bulwark of the American republic, and with a view to its security and permanence we recommend an amendment to the Constitution of the United States forbidding the application of any public funds or property for the benefit of any schools or institutions under sectarian control.

8. The revenue necessary for current expenditures and the obligations of the public debt must be largely derived from duties upon importations, which, so far as possible, should be adjusted to promote the interests of American labor and advance the prosperity of the whole country.

9. We reaffirm our opposition to further grants of the public lands to corporations and monopolies, and demand that the national domain be devoted to free homes for the people.

10. It is the imperative duty of the Government so to modify existing treaties with European governments, that the same protection shall be afforded to the adopted American citizen that is given to the native-born; and that all necessary laws should be passed to protect emigrants in the absence of power in the States for that purpose.

11. It is the immediate duty of Congress to fully investigate the effect of the immigration and importation of Mongolians upon the moral and material interests of the country.

12. The Republican party recognizes with approval the substantial advances recently made toward the establishment of equal rights for women by the many important amendments effected by Republican Legislatures in the laws which concern the personal and property relations of wives, mothers, and widows, and by the appointment and election of women to the superintendence of education, charities, and other public trusts. The honest demands of this class of citizens for additional rights, privileges, and immunities should be treated with respectful consideration.

13. The Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States for their government, and in the exercise of this power it is the right and duty of Congress to prohibit and extirpate in the Territories that relic of barbarism—polygamy; and we demand such legislation as shall secure this end, and the supremacy of American institutions in all the Territories.

14. The pledges which the Nation has given to her soldiers and sailors must be fulfilled, and a grateful people will always hold those who imperiled their lives for the country's preservation in the kindest remembrance.

15. We sincerely deprecate all sectional feeling and tendencies. We therefore note with deep solicitude that the Democratic party counts, as its chief hope of success, upon the electoral vote of a united South, secured through the efforts of those who were recently arrayed against the Nation; and we invoke the earnest attention of the country to the grave truth that a success thus achieved would reopen sectional strife and imperil national honor and human rights.

16. We charge the Democratic party with being the same in character and spirit as when it sympathized with treason; with making its control of the House of Representatives the triumph and opportunity of the Nation's recent foes; with reasserting and applauding in the National Capitol the sentiments of unrepentant rebellion; with sending Union soldiers to the rear, and promoting Confederate soldiers to the front; with deliberately proposing to repudiate the plighted faith of the Government; with being equally false and imbecile upon the overshadowing financial questions; with thwarting the ends of justice by its partisan mismanagement and obstruction of investigations; with proving itself, through the

period of its ascendancy in the lower House of Congress, utterly incompetent to administer the Government; and we warn the country against trusting a party thus alike unworthy, recreant, and incapable.

17. The National Administration merits commendation for its honorable work in the management of domestic and foreign affairs, and President Grant deserves the continued hearty gratitude of the American people for his patriotism and his eminent services, in war and in peace.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM, ST. LOUIS, 1876.

We, the delegates of the Democratic party of the United States, in National Convention assembled, do hereby declare the administration of the Federal Government to be in urgent need of immediate reform; do hereby enjoin upon the nominees of this Convention, and of the Democratic party in each State, a zealous effort and cooperation to this end; and do hereby appeal to our fellow citizens of every former political connection to undertake with us this first and most pressing patriotic duty.

For the Democracy of the whole country, we do here reaffirm our faith in the permanence of the Federal Union, our devotion to the Constitution of the United States, with its amendments universally accepted as a final settlement of the controversies that engendered civil war, and do here record our steadfast confidence in the perpetuity of republican self-government.

In absolute acquiescence in the will of the majority—the vital principle of republics; in the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; in the total separation of Church and State for the sake alike of civil and religious freedom; in the equality of all citizens before just laws of their own enactment; in the liberty of individual conduct, unvexed by sumptuary laws; in the faithful education of the rising generation, that they may preserve, enjoy, and transmit these best conditions of human happiness and hope, we behold the noblest products of a hundred years of changeful history; but while upholding the bond of our Union and great charter of these our rights, it behooves a free people to practice also that eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty.

Reform is necessary to rebuild and establish in the hearts of the whole people the Union, eleven years ago happily rescued from the danger of a secession of States; but now to be saved from a corrupt centralism, which, after inflicting upon ten States the rapacity of carpet-bag tyrannies,

has honeycombed the offices of the Federal Government itself with incapacity, waste, and fraud, infected States and municipalities with the contagion of misrule, and locked fast the prosperity of an industrious people in the paralysis of "hard times."

Reform is necessary to establish a sound currency, restore the public credit, and maintain the national honor.

We denounce the failure, for all these eleven years of peace, to make good the promise of the legal-tender notes, which are a changing standard of value in the hands of the people, and the non-payment of which is a disregard of the plighted faith of the nation.

We denounce the improvidence which, in eleven years of peace, has taken from the people in Federal taxes thirteen times the whole amount of the legal-tender notes, and squandered four times their sum in useless expense, without accumulating any reserve for their redemption.

We denounce the financial imbecility and immorality of that party, which, during eleven years of peace, has made no advance toward resumption, no preparation for resumption, but instead has obstructed resumption by wasting our resources and exhausting all our surplus income, and, while annually professing to intend a speedy return to specie payments, has annually enacted fresh hindrances thereto. As such a hindrance we denounce the resumption clause of the act of 1875, and we here demand its repeal.

We demand a judicious system of preparation by public economies, by official retrenchments, and by wise finance, which shall enable the nation soon to assure the whole world of its perfect ability and its perfect readiness to meet any of its promises at the call of the creditor entitled to payment.

We believe such a system, well devised, and, above all, intrusted to competent hands for execution, creating at no time an artificial scarcity of currency, and at no time alarming the public mind into a withdrawal of that vaster machinery of credit by which ninety-five per cent. of all business transactions are performed—a system open, public, and inspiring general confidence—would from the day of its adoption bring healing on its wings to all our harassed industries, set in motion the wheels of commerce, manufactures, and the mechanic arts, restore employment to labor, and renew in all its natural sources the prosperity of the people.

Reform is necessary in the sum and mode of Federal taxation, to the end that capital may be set free from distrust, and labor lightly burdened.

We denounce the present tariff, levied upon nearly 4,000 articles, as a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretense. It yields a dwindling, not a yearly rising revenue. It has impoverished many industries to subsidize a few. It prohibits imports that might purchase the products of American labor. It has degraded American commerce from the first to an inferior rank on the high seas. It has cut down the sales of American manufactures at home and abroad, and depleted the returns of American agriculture—an industry followed by half our people. It costs the people five times more than it produces to the Treasury, obstructs the processes of production, and wastes the fruits of labor. It promotes fraud, fosters smuggling, enriches dishonest officials, and bankrupts honest merchants. We demand that all Custom-House taxation shall be only for revenue.

Reform is necessary in the scale of public expenses—Federal, State, and municipal. Our Federal taxation has swollen from sixty millions, gold, in 1860, to four hundred and fifty millions, currency, in 1870; our aggregate taxation from one hundred and fifty-four millions, gold, in 1860, to seven hundred and thirty millions, currency, in 1870; or, in one decade, from less than five dollars per head to more than eighteen dollars per head. Since the peace, the people have paid to their tax-gatherers more than thrice the sum of the national debt, and more than twice that sum for the Federal Government alone. We demand a rigorous frugality in every department and from every officer of the Government.

Reform is necessary to put a stop to the profligate waste of public lands, and their diversion from actual settlers by the party in power, which has squandered 200,000,000 of acres upon railroads alone, and out of more than thrice that aggregate has disposed of less than a sixth directly to tillers of the soil.

Reform is necessary to correct the omissions of a Republican Congress, and the errors of our treaties and our diplomacy, which have stripped our fellow citizens of foreign birth and kindred race, recrossing the Atlantic, of the shield of American citizenship, and have exposed our brethren of the Pacific coast to the incursions of a race not sprung from the same great parent stock, and in fact now by law denied citizenship through naturalization, as being neither accustomed to the traditions of a progressive civilization nor exercised in liberty under equal laws. We denounce the policy which thus discards the liberty-loving German and tolerates a revival of the coolie trade in Mongolian women imported

for immoral purposes, and Mongolian men held to perform servile labor contracts, and demand such modification of the treaty with the Chinese Empire, or such legislation within constitutional limitations, as shall prevent further importation or immigration of the Mongolian race.

Reform is necessary, and can never be effected but by making it the controlling issue of the elections, and lifting it above the two false issues with which the office-holding class and the party in power seek to smother it:

1. The false issue with which they would enkindle sectarian strife in respect to the public schools, of which the establishment and support belong exclusively to the several States, and which the Democratic party has cherished from their foundation, and is resolved to maintain without prejudice or preferences for any class, sect, or creed, and without largesses from the treasury to any.

2. The false issue by which they seek to light anew the dying embers of sectional hate between kindred peoples once estranged, but now reunited in one indivisible republic and a common destiny.

Reform is necessary in the civil service. Experience proves that efficient, economical conduct of the governmental business is not possible if its civil service be subject to change at every election, be a prize fought for at the ballot-box, be a brief reward of party zeal, instead of posts of honor assigned for proved competency, and held for fidelity in the public employ; that the dispensing of patronage should neither be a tax upon the time of all our public men, nor the instrument of their ambition. Here, again, promises, falsified in the performance, attest that the party in power can work out no practical or salutary reform.

Reform is necessary even more in the higher grades of the public service. President, Vice-President, Judges, Senators, Representatives, Cabinet officers, these and all others in authority are the people's servants. Their offices are not a private perquisite; they are a public trust.

When the annals of this republic show the disgrace and censure of a Vice-President; a late Speaker of the House of Representatives marketing his rulings as a presiding officer; three Senators profiting secretly by their votes as law-makers; five chairmen of the leading committees of the late House of Representatives exposed in jobbery; a late Secretary of the Treasury forcing balances in the public accounts; a late Attorney-General misappropriating public funds; a Secretary of the Navy enriched or enriching friends by percentages levied off the profits of contractors

with his department; an ambassador to England censured in a dishonorable speculation; the President's private secretary barely escaping conviction upon trial for guilty complicity in frauds upon the revenue; a Secretary of War impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors—the demonstration is complete that the first step in reform must be the people's choice of honest men from another party, lest the disease of one political organization infect the body politic, and lest by making no change of men or parties we get no change of measures and no real reform.

All these abuses, wrongs, and crimes, the product of sixteen years' ascendancy of the Republican party, create a necessity for reform confessed by Republicans themselves, but their reformers are voted down in conventions and displaced from the Cabinet. The party's mass of honest voters is powerless to resist the eighty thousand officeholders, its leaders and guides.

Reform can only be had by a peaceful civic revolution. We demand a change of system, a change of administration, a change of parties, that we may have a change of measures and of men.

Resolved, That this Convention, representing the Democratic party of the United States, do cordially endorse the action of the present House of Representatives in reducing and curtailing the expenses of the Federal Government, in cutting down salaries, extravagant appropriations, and in abolishing useless offices and places not required by the public necessities; and we shall trust to the firmness of the Democratic members of the House that no committee of conference and no misinterpretation of the rules will be allowed to defeat these wholesome measures of economy demanded by the country.

Resolved, That the soldiers and sailors of the republic, and the widows and orphans of those who have fallen in battle, have a just claim upon the care, protection, and gratitude of their fellow citizens.

REPUBLICAN, CHICAGO, 1880.

The Republican party, in National Convention assembled, at the end of twenty years since the Federal Government was first committed to its charge, submits to the people of the United States this brief report of its administration.

It suppressed a rebellion which had armed nearly a million of men to subvert the national authority. It reconstructed the Union of the States, with freedom instead of slavery as its corner-stone. It transformed four million human

beings from the likeness of things to the rank of citizens. It relieved Congress from the infamous work of hunting fugitive slaves, and charged it to see that slavery does not exist. It has raised the value of our paper currency from thirty-eight per cent. to the par of gold. It has restored upon a solid basis payment in coin for all the national obligations, and has given us a currency absolutely good and equal in every part of our extended country. It has lifted the credit of the Nation from the point where six per cent. bonds sold at eighty-six to that where four per cent. bonds are eagerly sought at a premium.

Under its administration railways have increased from 31,000 miles, in 1860, to more than 82,000 miles, in 1879. Our foreign trade has increased from \$700,000,000 to \$1,500,000,000 in the same time, and our exports, which were \$20,000,000 less than our imports in 1860, were \$264,000,000 more than our imports in 1879.

Without resorting to loans, it has, since the war closed, defrayed the ordinary expenses of Government, besides the accruing interest on the public debt, and has annually disbursed more than \$30,000,000 for soldiers' pensions. It has paid \$888,000,000 of the public debt, and by refunding the balance at lower rates has reduced the annual interest charge from nearly \$151,000,000 to less than \$89,000,000. All the industries of the country have revived; labor is in demand; wages have increased, and throughout the entire country there is evidence of a coming prosperity greater than we have ever enjoyed.

Upon this record the Republican party asks for the continued confidence and support of the people, and this Convention submits for their approval the following statement of the principles and purposes which will continue to guide and inspire its efforts:

I. We affirm that the work of the last twenty-one years has been such as to commend itself to the favor of the Nation, and that the fruits of the costly victories which we have achieved through immense difficulties should be preserved; that the peace regained should be cherished; that the dissevered Union, now happily restored, should be perpetuated; and that the liberties secured to this generation should be transmitted undiminished to future generations; that the order established and the credit acquired should never be impaired; that the pensions promised should be extinguished by the full payment of every dollar thereof; that the reviving industries should be further promoted, and that the commerce already so great should be steadily encouraged.

II. The Constitution of the United States is a

supreme law, and not a mere contract. Out of confederated States it made a sovereign nation. Some powers are denied to the Nation, while others are denied to the States; but the boundary between the powers delegated and those reserved is to be determined by the National, and not by the State, tribunals.

III. The work of popular education is one left to the care of the several States, but it is the duty of the National Government to aid that work to the extent of its constitutional power. The intelligence of the Nation is but the aggregate of the intelligence in the several States, and the destiny of the Nation must not be guided by the genius of any one State, but by the average genius of all

IV. The Constitution wisely forbids Congress to make any law respecting an establishment of religion, but it is idle to hope that the Nation can be protected against the influence of sectarianism while each State is exposed to its domination. We, therefore, recommend that the Constitution be so amended as to lay the same prohibition upon the Legislature of each State, and to forbid the appropriation of public funds to the support of sectarian schools.

V. We affirm the belief, avowed in 1876, that the duties levied for the purpose of revenue should so discriminate as to favor American labor; that no further grant of the public domain should be made to any railway or other corporation; that slavery having perished in the States, its twin barbarity, polygamy, must die in the Territories; that everywhere the protection accorded to citizens of American birth must be secured to citizens by American adoption; and that we esteem it the duty of Congress to develop and improve our watercourses and harbors, but insist that further subsidies to private persons or corporations must cease. That the obligations of the Republic to the men who preserved its integrity in the hour of battle are undiminished by the lapse of the fifteen years since their final victory. To do them perpetual honor is, and shall for ever be, the grateful privilege and sacred duty of the American people.

VI. Since the authority to regulate immigration and intercourse between the United States and foreign nations rests with Congress, or with the United States and its treaty-making power, the Republican party, regarding the unrestricted immigration of the Chinese as an evil of great magnitude, invokes the exercise of those powers to restrain and limit that immigration by the enactment of such just, humane, and reasonable provisions as will produce that result.

VII That the purity and patriotism which characterized the earlier career of Rutherford B. Hayes, in peace and war, and which guided the thoughts of our immediate predecessors to him for a Presidential candidate, have continued to inspire him in his career as Chief Executive, and that history will accord to his administration the honors which are due to an efficient, just, and courteous discharge of the public business, and will honor his interpositions between the people and proposed partisan laws.

VIII. We charge upon the Democratic party the habitual sacrifice of patriotism and justice to a supreme and insatiable lust of office and patronage; that to obtain possession of the National and State Governments, and the control of place and position, they have obstructed all efforts to promote the purity and to conserve the freedom of suffrage, and have devised fraudulent certifications and returns; have labored to unseat lawfully elected members of Congress, to secure at all hazards the vote of a majority of the States in the House of Representatives; have endeavored to occupy, by force and fraud, the places of trust given to others by the people of Maine, and rescued by the courageous action of Maine's patriotic sons; have, by methods vicious in principle and tyrannical in practice, attached partisan legislation to appropriation bills, upon whose passage the very movement of the Government depends; have crushed the rights of individuals; have advocated the principles and sought the favor of rebellion against the Nation, and have endeavored to obliterate the sacred memories of the war, and to overcome its inestimably valuable results of nationality, personal freedom, and individual equality.

The Republican party, adhering to the principles affirmed by its last National Convention, of respect for the constitutional rules governing appointment to office, adopts the declaration of President Hayes, that the reform in the civil service shall be thorough, radical, and complete. To that end it demands the coöperation of the Legislative with the Executive Departments of the Government, and that Congress shall so legislate that fitness, ascertained by proper practical tests, shall admit to the public service; that the tenure of administrative offices (except those through which the distinctive policy of the party in power shall be carried out), shall be made permanent during good behavior, and that the power of removal for cause, with due responsibility for the good conduct of subordinates, shall accompany the power of appointment.

The equal, steady, and complete enforcement

of laws, and the protection of all our citizens in the enjoyment of all privileges and immunities guaranteed by the Constitution, are the first duties of the Nation. The dangers of a solid South can only be averted by a faithful performance of every promise which the Nation has made to the citizen. The execution of the laws and the punishment of all those who violate them are the only safe methods by which an enduring peace can be secured, and genuine prosperity established throughout the South. Whatever promises the Nation makes the Nation must perform, and the Nation can not with safety relegate this duty to the States. The solid South must be divided by the peaceful agencies of the ballot, and all opinions must there find free expression, and to this end the honest voter must be protected against terrorism, violence, or fraud. And we affirm it to be the duty and the purpose of the Republican party to use every legitimate means to restore all the States of this Union to the most perfect harmony that may be practicable; and we submit it to the practical, sensible people of the United States to say whether it would not be dangerous to the dearest interest of our country at this time to surrender the administration of the National Government to the party which seeks to overthrow the existing policy, under which we are so prosperous, and thus bring distrust and confusion where there are now order, confidence, and hope.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM, CINCINNATI, 1880.

The Democrats of the United States in Convention assembled declare

First. We pledge ourselves anew to the constitutional doctrines and traditions of the Democratic party, as illustrated by the teachings and example of a long line of Democratic statesmen and patriots and embodied in the platform of the last National Convention.

Second. Opposition to centralization and to that dangerous spirit of encroachment which tends to consolidate in one and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism; no sumptuary laws; separation of Church and State for the good of each; common schools fostered and protected

Third. Home rule, honest money, the strict maintenance of the public faith, consisting of gold and silver and paper convertible into coin on

demand, the strict maintenance of the public faith, State and National, and a tariff for revenue only.

Fourth. The subordination of the military to the civil power, and a genuine and thorough reform of the civil service.

Fifth. The right to a free ballot is a right preservative of all right, and must and shall be maintained in every part of the United States.

Sixth. The existing administration is the result of conspiracy only, and its claim of right to surround the ballot-box with troops and deputy marshals to intimidate and obstruct the electors, and the unprecedented use of the veto to maintain its corrupt and despotic power, insults the people and imperils their institutions.

Seventh. We execrate the course of this administration in making places in the civil service a reward for political crime, and demand a reform by statute, which shall make it for ever impossible for a defeated candidate to bribe his way to the seat of a usurper by billeting villains upon the people.

Eighth. The great fraud of 1876-'77, by which, upon a false count of the electoral votes of two States, the candidate defeated at the polls was declared to be President, and, for the first time in the American history, the will of the people was set aside under a threat of military violence, struck a deadly blow at our system of representative government. The Democratic party, to preserve the country from the horrors of a civil war, submitted for the time in the firm and patriotic belief that the people would punish this crime in 1880. This duty precedes and dwarfs every other. It imposes a more sacred duty upon the people of the Union than ever addressed the consciences of a nation of freemen.

Ninth. The resolution of S. J. Tilden not again to be a candidate for the exalted place to which he was elected by a majority of his countrymen, and from which he was excluded by the leaders of the Republican party, is received by the Democrats of the United States with deep sensibility; and they declare their confidence in his wisdom, patriotism, and integrity unshaken by the assaults of the common enemy, and they assure him that he is followed into the retirement he has chosen for himself by the sympathy and respect of his fellow citizens, who regard him as one who, by elevating the standard of the public morality, and adorning and purifying the public service, merits the lasting gratitude of his country and his party.

Free ships and a living chance for American ships upon the seas; on the land, no discrimina-

tion in favor of transportation lines, corporations, or monopolies.

Tenth. Amendment of the Burlingame treaty. No more Chinese emigration, except for travel, education, and foreign commerce, and therein carefully guarded.

Eleventh. Public money and public credit for public purposes solely, and public lands for actual settlers.

Twelfth. The Democratic party is the friend of labor and the laboring man, and pledges itself

to protect him alike against the cormorants and commune.

Thirteenth. We congratulate the country upon the honesty and thrift of a Democratic Congress, which has reduced the public expenditure \$40,000,000 a year; upon the continuation of prosperity at home, and the national honor abroad; and, above all, upon the promise of such a change in the administration of the Government as to insure us a genuine and lasting reform in every department of the public service.

II.

COMMENTARY ON DEMOCRATIC PLATFORMS BY "THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE."

THE Democratic party has been taking lessons of the Republican party for twenty-five years. Each successive Democratic platform in that period marks the adoption of some Republican principle, and the abandonment of some former Democratic doctrine. The Democracy has shown neither a just conception of what a principle is, nor a firm adherence to any consistent policy, right or wrong. It has affirmed and denied, adopted and rejected, all the political heresies of the time. It has combated, denounced, and finally agreed to and applauded every one of the great reforms wrought out by the Republican party. On questions of currency, taxation, and the public lands, as well as on the numerous issues of the war, reconstruction, and the payment of the public debt, it has occupied a variety of irreconcilable propositions pro and con. It has traveled completely around the circle of political apostasy. It has originated no new policy of the slightest value, and suggested none, but has been a constant drag and obstruction to the beneficent measures introduced by its opponents. It has trimmed its sails to catch every gust of popular passion or prejudice, while it has sought neither to guide nor to correct public opinion. It has never ascertained the will of the people until that will was ready to find some new mode of expression. Hence the Democracy has been continually behind the times. With the exception that it sticks to "State Sovereignty," it has been, in fact, an unprincipled camp-follower of the Republican party, snatching up eagerly the cast-off garments of the

great army, and skulking in the rear to avoid hardship and danger.

In all this period the Democracy has been actuated by no high motives. It has been either wholly selfish, as when it espoused the cause of the slaveholder in 1856, or distinctly treasonable, as when it pronounced the war "a failure" in 1864, or blindly revengeful, as when it favored the payment of the bonds in irredeemable scrip in 1868. The one controlling idea, which has dominated it unwaveringly for a quarter of a century, has been to get into office. All else that has been called Democracy has changed; but this idea has never changed. An examination of the official utterances of the party, made by National Conventions from 1856 to 1880, will justify the estimate of the character, aims, and acts of the Democracy which has been here given.

1856.—The Democratic Convention at Cincinnati, June 2, declared against internal improvements by the Government; resolved that Congress had no power to interfere with slavery in the States; approved the Fugitive Slave Law; adopted the principles of the Kansas-Nebraska bill—that is, the non-interference of the General Government with slavery in the Territories or the District of Columbia; *recognized the right of new States to regulate their domestic institutions with or without slavery, as they pleased*; upheld the principles of the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798 and 1799 (supposed to be a justification of the right of secession).

1860.—Both the Douglas and Breckinridge

Conventions readopted the Democratic pro-slavery platform of 1856.

1864.—The Democratic Convention at Chicago, August 29, 1864, adopted the following:

"Resolved, That this Convention does explicitly declare, as the sense of the American people, that, *after four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war*, during which, under the pretense of a military necessity or a war power higher than the Constitution, the Constitution itself has been disregarded in every part, and public liberty and private right alike trodden down, and the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired, justice, humanity, and the public welfare demand that *immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities.*"

1868.—The Democratic Convention at New York, July 4, 1868, in which Winfield Scott Hancock received 144½ votes, demanded the immediate restoration of all the rebel States to their "rights" in the Union; amnesty for all past political offenses; taxation of Government bonds; *incidental protection to domestic manufactures*; and adopted the following:

"Payment of the public debt of the United States as rapidly as practicable, and, when the obligations of the Government do not expressly state upon their face, or the law under which they were issued does not provide that they shall be paid in coin, *they ought, in right and justice, to be paid in the lawful money of the United States*" [meaning irredeemable notes].

Against Negro Suffrage.—"And we do declare and resolve that, ever since the people of the United States threw off all subjection to the British crown, *the privilege and trust of suffrage have belonged to the several States*; and that any attempt by Congress, on any pretext whatever, to deprive any State of this right, or interfere with its exercise, is a flagrant usurpation of power, which can find no warrant in the Constitution, and, if sanctioned by the people, will subvert our form of government, and can only end in a single centralized and consolidated Government, in which the separate existence of the States will be entirely absorbed, and an unqualified despotism be established in place of a Federal Union of coequal States. And that we regard the Reconstruction Acts (so called) of Congress as usurpations, and *unconstitutional, revolutionary, and void.*"

1872.—The National Democratic Convention at Baltimore, July, 1872, completely stultified the record of the party four years previously, as embodied in the above resolutions, by adopting the following:

"We hold that it is the duty of Government, in its dealings with the people, to mete out equal and exact justice to all, of whatever nativity, race, color, or persuasion, religious or political.

"We pledge ourselves to maintain the Union of these States, and to oppose any reopening of the questions settled by the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments [which the Convention of 1868 pronounced "unconstitutional, revolutionary, and void"].

"The public credit must be sacredly maintained, and we denounce repudiation in every form and guise. [In 1868 the party demanded the payment of the bonds in greenbacks.] Recognizing that there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade, *we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in their Congressional districts*, and to the decision of the Congress thereon, wholly free of Executive interference or dictation."

In 1856, 1860, and 1864 the party clamored for "free ships and free trade"; in 1868 for incidental protection; and now for the decision of the question by Congressional districts.

The platform of 1868 allowed that donations of public lands might be deemed necessary for "the encouragement of important public improvements." The platform of 1872 opposed the granting of lands for any improvements whatever.

1876.—The Democratic Convention at St. Louis, June 28, 1876, denounced the financial imbecility of the Republican party for making no progress toward resumption, and "denounced the resumption clause of the act of 1875 as a hindrance to resumption." Beyond "denouncing" the acts of the Republican party, it set forth no affirmative principles of its own, having learned wisdom by experience.

1880.—The late Convention at Cincinnati "pledged itself anew" to the doctrines and traditions of the party (including, it is presumed, the payment of the bonds in greenbacks, the opposition to negro suffrage, and the declaration that the war was a failure); demanded honest money (but did not pronounce the Resumption act a "hindrance to resumption"); execrated the "fraud of 1876-'77" (but did not deny the equal and free participation of the Democratic House in the Electoral Commission); demanded a free ballot (but did not ask the enforcement of the Fifteenth Amendment in the South); favored a tariff for revenue (and explained not why a Pennsylvania Protectionist sat in the Chair and made up the Committees of a Democratic House);

declared "unshaken confidence in Samuel J. Tilden"—and refused to nominate him.

Epitomizing the action of the Democratic party since 1856 on the great public questions of the day, it appears:

1. The Tariff.—That the party, since 1856, has favored absolute free trade, a revenue tariff, "incidental protection," and the remission of the question to the Congressional districts; and, at the present moment, has named as its candidate for the Presidency a Pennsylvania Protectionist.

2. The Currency.—In 1868 the party favored the payment of the bonds in greenbacks, and in 1876 it denounced the Resumption Act as "a hindrance to resumption," but now favors "honest money."

3. Reconstruction.—The constitutional amendments were declared "revolutionary and void" in 1868; their rigid enforcement demanded in 1872; accepted in form in 1876; and broken in letter and spirit by the Southern Democrats from the day they were adopted till now.

4. The war was pronounced a failure in 1864,

its results partially agreed to in 1868; and the soldiers and sailors have been thanked in every Democratic platform since

5. The Democratic party has wholly abandoned the ante-war theory of the party in regard to public improvements, and has adopted the Republican theory; the Southern States lately in rebellion being now the most clamorous for appropriations from the public treasury.

6. The Democratic party now comes before the country without a single affirmative principle, except such as it has stolen from the Republican party, and the one original issue of State supremacy in national elections, which is a lingering relic of the exploded doctrine of State Rights.

7. With emancipation and negro suffrage disappeared the one cohesive principle of the original Democracy, that is, slavery. Since that time it has shifted its ground in every campaign, and resembles the old party whose name it bears only in its total lack of all principle, its hostility to the idea of Federal unity and supremacy, and its greediness for the spoils of office.

III.

GENERAL HANCOCK'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE.

GOVERNOR'S ISLAND, NEW YORK CITY, }
July 29, 1880.

GENTLEMEN: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of June 13, 1880, apprising me formally of my nomination to the office of President of the United States by the National Democratic Convention, lately assembled in Cincinnati. I accept the nomination with grateful appreciation of the confidence reposed in me.

The principles enumerated by the Convention are those I have cherished in the past, and shall endeavor to maintain in the future. The Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, embodying the results of the war for the Union, are inviolable. If called to the Presidency, I should deem it my duty to resist with all of my power any attempt to impair or evade the full force and effect of the Constitution, which, in every article, section, and amendment, is the supreme law of the land. The Constitution forms the basis of the Government of the United States. The powers granted by it to the legislative, executive, and

judicial departments, define and limit the authority of the General Government; powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, belong to the States respectively, or to the people. The General and State governments, each acting in its own sphere, without trenching upon the lawful jurisdiction of the other, constitute the Union. This Union, comprising a General Government with general powers, and State governments with State powers for purposes local to the States, is a polity, the foundations of which were laid in the profoundest wisdom.

This is the Union our fathers made, and which has been so respected abroad and so beneficent at home. Tried by blood and fire, it stands today a model form of free popular government; a political system which, rightly administered, has been, and will continue to be, the admiration of the world. May we not say nearly in the words of Washington: The unity of government, which constitutes us one people, is justly dear to us; it is the main pillar in the edifice of our real independence, the support of our peace, safety,

and prosperity, and of that liberty we so highly prize, and intend at every hazard to preserve.

But no form of government, however carefully devised, no principles, however sound, will protect the rights of the people unless administration is faithful and efficient. It is a vital principle in our system, that neither fraud nor force must be allowed to subvert the rights of the people. When fraud, violence, or incompetence controls, the noblest constitutions and wisest laws are useless. The bayonet is not a fit instrument for collecting the votes of freemen. It is only by a full vote, free ballot, and fair count that the people can rule in fact, as required by the theory of our government. Take this foundation away, and the whole structure falls.

Public office is a trust, not a bounty bestowed upon the holder; no incompetent or dishonest persons should ever be intrusted with it, or if appointed, they should be promptly ejected.

The basis of a substantial, practical civil service reform must first be established by the people in filling the elective offices; if they fix a high standard of qualification for office, and sternly reject the corrupt and incompetent, the result will be decisive in governing the action of the servants whom they trust with appointing power.

The War for the Union was successfully closed more than fifteen years ago. All classes of our people must share alike in the blessings of the Union, and are equally concerned in its perpetuity, and in the proper administration of public affairs. We are in a state of profound peace. Henceforth let it be our purpose to cultivate sentiments of friendship and not of animosity among our fellow citizens.

Our material interests, varied and progressive, demand our constant and united efforts. A sedulous and scrupulous care of the public credit, together with a wise and economical management of our governmental expenditures, should be maintained in order that labor may be lightly burdened, and that all persons may be protected in their rights to the fruits of their own industry. The time has come to enjoy the substantial benefits of reconciliation. As one people we have common interests. Let us encourage the harmony and generous rivalry among our own industries which will revive our languishing merchant marine, extend our commerce with foreign nations, assist our merchants, manufacturers, and producers to develop our vast natural resources, and increase the prosperity and happiness of our people.

If elected, I shall, with the Divine favor, labor with what ability I possess to discharge my duties with fidelity, according to my convictions, and shall take care to protect and defend the Union, and to see that the laws are faithfully and equally executed in all parts of the country alike. I will assume the responsibility, fully sensible of the fact that to administer rightly the functions of government is to discharge the most sacred duty that can devolve upon an American citizen.

I am, very respectfully, yours,

WINFIELD S. HANCOCK.

To the Hon. JOHN W. STEVENSON, President of the Convention, the Hon. JOHN P. STOCKTON, Chairman, and others of the Committee of the National Democratic Convention.

D. Appleton & Co.'s New Publications.

The Brain as an Organ of Mind.

By H. CHARLTON BASTIAN, Professor of Anatomy and Clinical Medicine in University College, London; author of "Paralysis from Brain Disease." With numerous Illustrations. One vol., 12mo, 708 pages. Cloth. Price, \$2.50.

"The fullest scientific exposition yet published of the views held on the subject of psychology by the advanced physiological school. It teems with new and suggestive ideas; and, though the author displays throughout his customary boldness of speculation, he does not allow himself to be carried away so freely as of old by his own exuberant wealth of 'scientific imagination.'"—*London Athenæum*.

SECOND VOLUME OF

Cooley's Cyclopædia of Practical Receipts.

Cooley's Cyclopædia of Practical Receipts and Collateral Information in the Arts, Manufactures, Professions, and Trades, etc., etc. Sixth edition, revised and partly rewritten by Professor RICHARD V. TUSON. Volume two, completing the work, now ready. 8vo, 1,796 pages (complete). Price, \$4.50 per volume.

A History of Philosophy in Epitome.

By ALBERT SCHWEGLER. Translated from the first edition of the original German by Julius H. Seelye. Revised from the ninth German edition, containing Important Additions and Modifications, with an Appendix, continuing the History in its more Prominent Lines of Development since the Time of Hegel, by Benjamin T. Smith. 12mo, 469 pages. Cloth. Price, \$2.00.

A Short Life of Gladstone.

By C. H. JONES, author of "A Short Life of Charles Dickens," "Macaulay," etc. "New Handy-Volume Series." Paper, 35 cents; cloth, 60 cents.

Livy.

By the Rev. W. W. CAPES, M. A. Fifth volume in "CLASSICAL WRITERS." 16mo, flexible. Price, 60 cents. Previously published in the series: "Milton," "Euripides," "Sophocles," "Vergil." Uniform style. 60 cents each.

Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical.

By HERBERT SPENCER. A new cheap edition of Herbert Spencer's famous Essays on Education. One vol., 12mo, paper cover. Price, 50 cents.

Appletons' Summer Book.

A Unique Volume for the Traveler by Rail or Steamboat, or the Country Sojourner at the Seaside, in the Mountains, or wherever he may be. Contains Stories and Sketches suitable for the Season, and a Great Number of Articles on Summer Topics.

"'Appletons' Summer Book' contains a large amount of very interesting and instructive reading in the form of timely papers dealing with summer topics. There are also articles on 'Our Summer Pleasure-Places,' by O. B. Bunce; 'About Fishing,' by Barnet Phillips; 'A Trip up the Hudson,' by C. H. Jones; 'Vacation in Colorado,' by W. H. Rideing; 'Summer Pictures,' by O. B. Bunce; and other papers by George Cooper, Ernest Ingersoll, R. R. Bowker, Nugent Robinson, C. E. Craddock, and others; and poems by E. C. Stedman, George Edgar Montgomery, and A. B. Street. The book is copiously and admirably illustrated, and the whole proves a capital collection of light and pleasing amusement for an idle afternoon."—*Boston Gazette*.

Superbly illustrated, with an exquisite Design engraved on Steel for the Cover. Large 8vo. Price, 50 cents.

Scientific Billiards.

Garnier's Practice Shots, with Hints to Amateurs. 106 Diagrams in Colors. By ALBERT GARNIER. Oblong 12mo. Price, \$3.50.

Health.

By W. H. CORFIELD, Professor of Hygiene and Public Health at University College, London. 12mo. Cloth. Price, \$1.25.

"The first seven chapters are devoted to a description of the human body and an explanation of the offices of its various members, the author believing that it is absolutely essential to know something of the organization which is to be kept healthy. The remaining chapters treat upon air, lighting and warming, ventilation, food and drink, water, climate, houses, diseases, etc. It is a thorough work upon an important subject, prepared by a competent hand, and deserves careful reading."—*Boston Evening Transcript*.

French Men of Letters.

Personal and Anecdotal Sketches of VICTOR HUGO; ALFRED DE MUSSET; THÉOPHILE GAUTIER; HENRI MURGER; SAINTE-BEUVE; GÉRARD DE NERVAL; ALEXANDRE DUMAS, FILS; ÉMILE AUGIER; OCTAVE FEUILLET; VICTORIEN SARDOU; ALPHONSE DAUDET; and ÉMILE ZOLA. By MAURICE MAURIS. Appletons' "New Handy-Volume Series." Paper, 35 cents; cloth, 60 cents.

"A notable addition is made to Appletons' admirable 'New Handy-Volume Series,' in 'French Men of Letters,' by Maurice Mauris. It is a delightful book, containing a dozen sketches of the great men whose names are known to all the world, but whose personalities, for the most part, the world only guesses at. The little book really is charming: as good reading as a good novel, and above even the best of novels in that its characters are real."—*Philadelphia Times*.

Memories of my Exile.

By LOUIS KOSSUTH. Translated from the original Hungarian by FERENCZ JAUSZ.
One vol, crown 8vo. Cloth. Price, \$2 00.

This important work relates to the period when the Italian Kingdom was being established, and gives the Secret Treaties and details of the understanding between England, the Emperor Napoleon, and Count Cavour

"These 'Memories' disclose a curious episode in the inner life of English domestic politics"—*The Nation*.

The Story of an Honest Man.

A NOVEL. By EDMOND ABOUT. One vol., 8vo Paper. Price, 50 cents.

"The story has the charm of a simplicity unmatched except in 'The Vicar of Wakefield.' Its personages are men and women whom, the reader feels, it is good to know. . . . We wish that we might write a word here which would persuade all readers to read M. About's work. It is worthier of attention than most books are, and it will repay attention far more liberally than most books do"—*New York Evening Post*.

The Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews.

Translated and critically examined by MICHAEL HEILPRIN. Vol. II Crown 8vo.
Cloth. Price, \$2.00.

"The notion has somehow got abroad that the scientific study of the Bible is inconsistent with the most tender reverence for its contents, or with their persistent fascination. But the reverence of Mr. Heilprin for the subject-matter of his criticism could hardly be surpassed; and, that it has not lost its power to interest and charm, his book itself is ample evidence, which will be reënforced by the experience of every intelligent reader of its too brief contents."—*The Nation*, July 24, 1879.

A Thousand Flashes of French Wit, Wisdom, and Wickedness.

Collected and translated by J. DE FENOD. One vol., 16mo. Cloth. Price, \$1.00.

This work consists of a collection of wise and brilliant sayings from French writers, making a rich and piquant book of fresh quotations.

"The book is a charming one to take up for an idle moment during the warm weather, and is just the thing to read on the hotel piazza to a mixed company of ladies and gentlemen. Some of its sayings about the first mentioned would no doubt occasion lively discussion, but that is just what is needed to dispel the often wellnigh intolerable languor of a summer afternoon."—*Boston Courier*.

The Watering-Places and Mineral Springs of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland.

With Notes on Climatic Resorts and Consumption, Sanitariums, Peat, Mud, and Sand Baths, Whey and Grape Cures, etc. A Popular Medical Guide. By EDWARD GUTMAN, M. D. With Maps and Illustrations. One vol., 12mo. Cloth. Price, \$2.50.

FIFTH AND LAST VOLUME OF THE LIFE OF THE PRINCE
CONSORT.

The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort.

By Sir THEODORE MARTIN. Fifth and concluding volume. One vol., 12mo. Cloth. Price, \$2.00. Vols. I, II, III, and IV, at same price per volume.

"The literature of England is richer by a book which will be read with profit by succeeding generations of her sons and daughters."—*Blackwood*.

"Sir Theodore Martin has completed his work, and completed it in a manner which has fairly entitled him to the honor conferred upon him on its conclusion. It is well done from beginning to end."—*Spectator*.

The Life and Writings of Henry Thomas Buckle.

By ALFRED HENRY HUTH. 12mo. Cloth. Price, \$2.00.

"To all admirers of Buckle Mr. Huth has rendered a welcome service by the publication of these volumes, while to those who have been prejudiced against him, either by his own bold writings or by the unjust treatment he has received at the hands of many critics, and even some would-be panegyrists, they should be of yet greater service."—*London Athenæum*.

The Fundamental Concepts

OF MODERN PHILOSOPHIC THOUGHT, CRITICALLY AND HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED. By RUDOLPH EUCKEN, Ph. D., Professor in Jena. With an Introduction by NOAH PORTER, President of Yale College. One vol., 12mo, 304 pages. Cloth. Price, \$1.75.

President Porter declares of this work that "there are few books within his knowledge which are better fitted to aid the student who wishes to acquaint himself with the course of modern speculation and scientific thinking, and to form an intelligent estimate of most of the current theories."

The Crayfish.

An Introduction to the Study of Zoölogy. By Professor T. H. HUXLEY, F. R. S. With 82 Illustrations. Forming volume 28 of "The International Scientific Series." 12mo. Cloth. Price, \$1.75.

The object of Professor Huxley's new book is to afford an opportunity to students to commence the study of zoölogy by means of a careful verification of nearly all that is known concerning a single animal, the common crayfish. The book is termed an "Introduction to Zoölogy." "For whoever will follow its pages, crayfish in hand, and will try to verify for himself the statements which it contains, will find himself brought face to face with all the great zoölogical questions which excite so lively an interest at the present day."

Strange Stories.

By ERCKMANN-CHATRIAN. "New Handy-Volume Series." Paper, 30 cents.

A collection of weird stories, embodying remarkable psychological experiences, of a character to recall the stories of Edgar A. Poe.

Dr. Heidenhoff's Process.

A STORY. By EDWARD BELLAMY. "New Handy-Volume Series." Price, 25 cts.

"'Dr. Heidenhoff's Process' must be cited as among the most remarkable of our recent short romances."—*New York Times*.

Two Russian Idyls.

"New Handy-Volume Series." Paper, 30 cents.

The two stories, in one volume, "Marcella" and "Esfir," are fresh and charming productions, giving some very agreeable pictures of Russian life, and delightful portraits of character.

Little Comedies.

By JULIAN STURGIS, author of "John-a-Dreams," "An Accomplished Gentleman," etc. "New Handy-Volume Series." Paper, 30 cents.

"They are light, sparkling, piquant, and amusing. They hit off, in the course of conversations carried on between men and women of the world, social foibles with a wit remarkable for its keenness. . . . On a hot summer's day they would make peculiarly delicious reading—not too exhilarating, but softly, pleasantly flowing along."—*London Standard*.

For sale by all booksellers; or any work sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price.

D. APPLETON & CO., Publishers,
1, 3, & 5 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



138 068

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY